

Bendery Str.

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW



*An American Journal
Devoted to Russia
Past and Present*

Spring
1944

Vol. 3, No. 2

Price \$1.00

Contributors to This Issue

WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN, foreign correspondent in Soviet Russia for the *Christian Science Monitor*, 1922-1933, is the author of well-known works on the Soviet Union, including his latest book, *The Russian Enigma*, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943.

MICHAEL KARPOVICH is Associate Professor of History, Harvard University, and author of *Imperial Russia, 1801-1917*, 1932 and (with W. Bowden and A. P. Usher) of *An Economic History of Europe Since 1750*, 1937.

JOHN N. HAZARD after graduating from Yale College and the Harvard Law School, attended the Moscow Juridical Institute, 1934-1937; he has lectured and written extensively on Soviet Government and Soviet Law and is at present a member of the Soviet Supply Division of the Foreign Economic Administration in Washington, D. C.

ALBERT PARRY, journalist and historian, is author of *Whistler's Father*, 1939, *Russian Cavalcade*, 1944, and of articles for popular and scholarly periodicals in the field of Russian-American relations.

ERNEST J. SIMMONS, Associate Professor of Slavic Languages at Cornell University and Director of Cornell's Summer Course in Contemporary Russian Civilization is the author of *English Literature and Culture in Russia*, of biographies of Pushkin and Dostoevsky, and is now engaged in writing a life of Leo Tolstoy.

VLADIMIR ZENZINOV is a well-known Russian Socialist leader and journalist, and author of *The Road to Oblivion*, 1931; he is now residing in New York.

EUGENE RAITCH is the literary pseudonym of a distinguished Russian chemist, now in this country, who is both a poet and a student of literature.

VERA ALEXANDROVA, Russian literary critic; has contributed widely to French, German and American publications on Russian affairs; she is now at work on a book on contemporary Russian literature.

NINA VERNADSKY is a Russian musician and a student of Russian music and folklore.

NIKANDER STRELSKY is Associate Professor of Russian and Comparative Slavonic Literature at Vassar College.

KATHARINE STRELSKY is Chairman of the Bibliography Committee of the Slavonic Division of the Modern Language Association.

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

An American Journal Devoted to Russia
Past and Present

Vol. 3

SPRING 1944

No. 2

* * *

Russia After the War, <i>William Henry Chamberlin</i>	3
Church and State in Russian History, <i>Michael Karpovich</i>	10
The Federal Organization of the U.S.S.R., <i>John N. Hazard</i>	21
Russian Names for American Towns, <i>Albert Parry</i>	30
Tolstoy's Childhood, <i>Ernest J. Simmons</i>	44
The Soviet Arctic, <i>Vladimir Zenzinov</i>	65
Pushkin's Ode to the Old School Tie (with an original translation of Pushkin's poem "October 17, 1825"), <i>Eugene Raitch</i>	74
Russian Emigrés in Western European Literature, <i>Vera Alexandrova</i>	87
Russian Folk-Song, <i>Nina Vernadsky</i>	94

BOOK REVIEWS

What Russia Wants, by Joachim Joesten; Russia and Postwar Europe, by David Dallin, <i>Foster R. H. Dulles</i>	100
The Russian Enigma, by William Henry Chamberlin, <i>D. Fedotoff White</i>	101
Soviet Labor and Industry, by Leonard Hubbard, <i>Manya Gordon</i>	103
The Growth of the Red Army, by D. Fedotoff White; The Russian Army, by Walter Kerr, <i>T. H. Thomas</i>	104

(Continued on page II)

A Short History of Russia, by B. H. Sumner; Soul of Russia, by Helen Iswolsky, <i>Michael Karpovich</i>	107
Ancient Russia, by George Vernadsky, <i>A. Vasiliev</i>	109
The First Scientific Exploration of Russian America, by James A. James; Lord of Alaska, by Hector Chevigny, <i>Alexander Tarsaidzé</i>	111
A Treasury of Russian Life and Humor, by John Cournos (ed.); A Treasury of Great Russian Short Stories, by A. Yarmolinsky (ed.); A Treasury of Russian Literature, by Bernard Guernsey (ed.) <i>Dimitri von Mohrenschildt</i>	112
Slavic Studies by Alexander Kaun and Ernest J. Simmons (eds.), <i>F. J. Whitfield</i>	115
A Professor at Large, by Stephen Duggan, <i>E. T. Colton</i>	117

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Articles on Russia published in 1943, <i>Nikander and Katherine Strelsky</i>	119
--	-----

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

William Henry Chamberlin

Editor

Michael Karpovich

Associate Editor

Dimitri von Mohrenschildt

Managing Editor

ADVISORY EDITORIAL BOARD

James Donald Adams	Alexander Nazarov	Alexander Tarsaidzé
Stephen Duggan	George R. Noyes	Lucy E. Textor
H. H. Fisher	Bernard Pares	Countess A. Tolstoy
Waclaw Lednicki	Peter Pertzoff	Edmund Wilson
Gregory Lounz	Michael Rostovtzeff	Alexis Wiren
Clarence Manning	Nikander Strelsky	Nicholas Wreden

The aim of "The Russian Review" is to present a non-partisan interpretation of Russian history, civilization, and culture. The Review invites contributions by authors of divergent views, but the opinions expressed in any individual article in this journal are not necessarily those of the editors.

All dates pertaining to Russia prior to the introduction of the new style (Gregorian Calendar) on February 1, 1918, are according to the old style. The emblem on the cover of "The Russian Review" is an original design by M. V. Dobujinsky, representing "Alkonost," a mythical figure, half-woman, half-bird, popular in Russian folk-lore.

Copyright 1944, and published semi-annually in November and April, by "The Russian Review," 215 West 23rd Street, New York, N. Y. Subscription rates: \$2.00 a year in the United States; Canada \$2.20; foreign \$2.50; single copy \$1.00. The contents of this publication cannot be reprinted without the permission of the editors. Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelopes.

Russia After The War

BY WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

ONLY the fool who traditionally rushes in blithely where angels fear to tread would be cocksure in his certainty about the future course of events in the Soviet Union. Even in the United States and in Great Britain, where there is full freedom of discussion, there is no universal consensus of opinion about political and economic trends after the end of the war. It is naturally much more difficult to chart a blueprint for the Soviet Union, where there are no public forums or discussions on the air, where changes of great potential significance, such as the recent extension of the autonomous rights of the constituent republics, are rushed through an always unanimous parliament. Changes and moods in Soviet foreign policy, instead of taking place under the watchful eyes of scores of more or less well informed newspapermen and commentators, must often be guessed at by careful scanning of the headlines and the "rumor" columns of the strictly controlled Soviet press.

The peoples of the Soviet Union have passed through an experience that is searing and profound to the last degree. No war in Russia's long and stormy history has taken so great a toll of human lives. On the basis of Soviet official figures five million would seem to be a moderate estimate of the military casualties. And it is highly probable that an equal number of civilians have perished in guerrilla warfare and from hunger and disease and cold in the occupied regions which were laid waste so ruthlessly by the Germans during their retreat.

A foreign observer in Russia during the present war remarked to me that the plight of the peasants in the occupied territory was indeed difficult, with the Germans threatening to kill them if they did not collaborate and the guerrillas threatening to kill them if they did. Some of the largest cities of the Soviet Union, Kharkov, Kiev, and Stalingrad, have been reduced to skeletons and shells.

Yet, and here is one of the curious paradoxes of Russia's future, the bitter misery of tens of millions of the Soviet peoples has been accompanied by an immense increase in the prospective power, prestige, and influence of the Soviet state. It is interesting to recall

in this connection the recently expressed views of the Prime Minister of South Africa, Marshal Jan Christian Smuts. Smuts is no irresponsible sensational publicist, but one of the shrewdest and most astute of the senior statesmen of the British Empire. And this is how he describes the future position of the Soviet Union:

Russia is the new colossus on the European continent. What the after-effects of that will be, no one can say. We can but recognize that this is a new fact to reckon with, and we must reckon with it coldly and objectively. With the others (Marshal Smuts is referring to Germany, France and Italy) down and out and herself the mistress of the continent, her power will not only be great on that account, but will be still greater because the Japanese Empire will also have gone the way of all flesh. Therefore any check or balance that might have arisen in the East will have disappeared. You will have Russia in a position which no country has ever occupied in the history of Europe.

That Stalin is also very conscious of Russia's prospective new power is evident from the feverish pace of Soviet diplomatic and political activity during the first weeks of 1944. Moscow began to make the front pages in this field more frequently than Washington or London, as a brief summary of the more striking Soviet moves will indicate. Wendell Willkie was roundly abused in the Communist Party organ, *Pravda*, for suggesting, in the course of a very friendly article about the Soviet Union, that there should be some consideration for the rights of the smaller neighbors of the Soviet Union. *Pravda* also created a brief international sensation by giving publicity to a rumor that the British government was engaged in separate peace negotiations. The Soviet government made it clear in two firmly worded notes that it would deal only with a reorganized Polish government-in-exile, and on a basis of retaining most of the former Polish territory which was occupied in 1939. American mediation in this question was declined.

Finland was fiercely attacked in the Soviet press, and Helsinki was severely bombed. And there was a striking reallocation of powers, as between the central government and the constituent Republics. The latter were granted control over foreign policy and military affairs—provinces which had formerly been reserved for the central government. The American Communist Party, which has always faithfully followed the desires of Moscow, dissolved itself as a political party and came out with an extremely mild political and economic program. The American Communists now profess acceptance of the two-party system and of free enterprise for the United States, although they presumably favor the one-party system

and a state-controlled economy for the Soviet Union.

Now each of these moves, considered individually, was capable of creating some confusion and divided interpretations abroad. But taken together, I believe these moves fit in with the pattern of a coherent and logical policy, a policy which Stalin has pursued for some years. Compared with Lenin twenty-five years ago, the present Soviet dictator is much less inclined to preach a crusade for international revolution. On the other hand, he is much tougher and more intransigent on questions of Russian nationalist ambitions and strategic interests.

There is little or no evidence in recent years that Stalin has been advocating anywhere, even in Germany, violent social revolution of the 1917 Russian Bolshevik model. The lamblike transformation of the American Communists speaks for itself. The so-called Union of Polish Patriots, the pro-Soviet Polish group which Stalin has been fostering in Moscow, has issued a program rather more moderate in phrasing than the program of the Polish Socialist Party, which is represented in the Polish government-in-exile.

The Free Germany Committee, which began to issue manifestoes in Moscow in the summer of 1943, obviously with Stalin's approval and authorization, has been emphasizing not communism but anti-Hitler nationalism. Soviet propaganda beamed to the Balkans has been of a sentimental Pan-Slav type. It could have been borrowed from some of Russia's Slavophile publicists of the nineteenth century.

On the other hand, Stalin has been uncompromising in his insistence on the retention of all the territory he took during the period of Soviet-German agreement after the pact with Hitler in August, 1939. The only modification he has admitted is a possible slight rectification of the Soviet-Polish border; this is apparently conditional upon the organization of a Polish government to Stalin's liking.

As the tide of battle has flowed more in favor of the Red Army, the Soviet government has made it increasingly clear that neither the non-aggression treaties which it signed with its Western neighbors in the thirties, nor the Atlantic Charter, nor the agreements of Moscow and Teheran will prevent it from organizing an exclusive sphere of influence in Eastern Europe which will extend considerably beyond its political frontier. The claim to remake the Polish government is one significant straw in this connection. The veto on federation plans for the states of eastern and central Europe is another.

A government that changes its composition in response to dictation from outside can no longer be considered genuinely independent. A

concession of this kind is especially difficult for the Poles, who have suffered so much in the past from the interference of stronger neighbors in their affairs. The opposition to federative plans among the smaller countries that lie between Russia and Germany, announced in *Izvestia* after the Moscow Conference last autumn, clearly reflects the Soviet preference for concluding individual treaties with those countries which are not marked for outright annexation. This procedure has already been followed in the case of Czechoslovakia.

The recent grant of control of military affairs and foreign relations to the constituent republics is interesting and significant for considerations both of foreign and of domestic policy. The immediate practical effects are likely to be felt more in the former field than in the latter.

A constitutional set-up that is looser and more flexible, at least on paper, is more convenient for the purpose of covering territorial expansion. It will be an excellent talking point for the type of foreign commentator on Soviet affairs who regards the Soviet Constitution of 1936 as an accurate description of the actual state of political, civil, and personal liberty in the Soviet Union.

The extension of autonomy, if it is fully and genuinely implemented, might be expected to exert a favorable effect on the Baltic peoples in the way of reconciling them to inclusion in the Soviet Union. And it may, in time, develop into a standard type of political relationship with the countries of eastern, central, and southeastern Europe which Stalin, in all probability, does not propose to Sovietize, but wishes to keep in political leading-strings. A list of such countries would include almost certainly what remains of Poland, Finland, and Rumania, together with Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, in whatever form this last state may emerge from its present turmoil. Possibly this Soviet sphere of influence will expand to take in Hungary and Austria, Greece, and Turkey.

The immediate practical change in the internal relationship of the Soviet republics as a result of the new autonomy is not likely to be great. Comparisons with the British Commonwealth of Nations are wildly wide of the mark. It will be a long time before the Prime Minister of the Ukraine will criticize openly the speech of a Soviet Ambassador in another country, as the Canadian Prime Minister Mackenzie King recently took issue with Lord Halifax's Toronto speech.

The fact that the Soviet Union is a continuous land mass, with a centralized transportation system and no natural frontiers between its republics makes for closer trade and economic relations than one

finds in the British Commonwealth, where Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa are separated from Great Britain by thousands of miles of sea. Moreover, the British Dominions inherited from England itself a tradition of parliamentarism and self-government. This tradition is deficient in Russia and completely absent in such Asiatic republics as Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Kirghizia, Turkmenistan, Tadjikistan.

One may, to be sure, anticipate that the cultural autonomy which the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union have enjoyed will bring, after a long lapse of time, a certain measure of political self-government and local economic initiative. Local nationalism is a reality, strongest probably in the more advanced republics, in the Ukraine and White Russia, in Georgia and Armenia, existent to some degree in the more primitive and economically backward regions of the country.

But before any very genuine decentralization can take place in the Soviet constitutional arrangements, the one-party dictatorship must be scrapped or at least very considerably modified and relaxed. For the one-party dictatorship, as it has functioned up to the present time, is centralist in the highest degree.

Every Communist, whether he be a Russian, an Ukrainian, a Caucasian, a Central Asian by race or nationality, is subject to the orders and discipline of the central organs of the Party in Moscow. This situation makes genuine national independence for the constituent republics impracticable. While the Prime Minister of the Ukraine or White Russia or Georgia is, as a general rule, an Ukrainian or a White Russian or a Georgian, his first loyalty is to the Communist Party Political Bureau or to its chief figure, Stalin, not to his nominal constituents. Should he transgress the "Party line," he would disappear from office with lightning speed.

So what is really important for the future evolution of the Soviet Union is not the formal wording of the Constitution or of new decrees, but the maintenance or relaxation of the Communist Party dictatorship. So long as the dictatorship remains, the wording of a diplomatic note may be in Ukrainian or in Armenian, but the controlling direction will always come from Moscow.

It would be unrealistic to expect an extensive lightening of the centralized rule in the immediate post-war period, although the Soviet government will probably do what it can to relieve the terrific physical strain and privations to which the Soviet peoples have been subjected during the war. Even in England, classical country of parliamentarism, voices are raised in favor of a continua-

tion of the coalition system of government after the war, on the ground that problems are too urgent and necessary sacrifices are too great to permit a resumption of the battle of parties. Similar considerations will certainly weigh heavily with the rulers of the Soviet Union, who have no parliamentary "prejudices" to overcome.

However, as the present desolation yields to reconstruction there may well be, partly as a result of the war and the intimate part which the whole people took in the war, some loosening of the tighter Soviet state controls. There may be more freedom to choose and quit a job, more assertion, in one way or another, by the workers and peasants of their direct class interests.

One element in the situation that may make a return to the pre-1941 Party bureaucratic rule impossible is the new greatly enhanced power and prestige of the Red Army. In the Army one finds the centre of the nationalism that has so largely displaced the old slogans of international communism. It is the heroes of Old Russia, Alexander Nevsky, Suvorov, Kutuzov, who are the heroes of the present-day Red Army. The political commissars, formerly the eyes and ears of the Party in the Army, have lost their former status. The younger men who have come to leadership in the huge, strongly disciplined army of the Soviet-German War can hardly be denied a strong voice in the determination of Russia's future.

Stalin, with his usual political intuition, has adjusted himself to the new situation by emphasizing the military, rather than the political side of his leadership. It was in his Marshal's uniform that he met Roosevelt and Churchill. Not long ago he was awarded the Order of Suvorov, a development that would have seemed incongruous and grotesque in the first years of the Soviet régime, when all association with the Tsarist past was vehemently repudiated.

One could imagine two alternative effects of the increased power of the Army. The more politically minded officers may be drawn into the Communist Party bureaucracy and absorbed. Or the Army leadership may prove to be a force that will lead to the weakening, perhaps to the ultimate downfall of the Party régime. It may be assumed that Stalin will make every effort to see that the first of these alternatives is realized.

It may be expected that Russia will resume its drive toward industrialization after the elementary task of repairing the havoc of war has been completed. One inevitable trend in Russian life that has been speeded up by the war is a shift of population to the East. Many of the refugees from the Ukraine, White Russia, and the regions of European Russia, which were held by the Germans two years, will

never return to their shattered homes. They will remain in the Urals, in Siberia and Central Asia, regions that are certain to be much more important in population and industrial productivity in the future.

As Wendell Willkie and other foreign visitors to the Soviet Union have observed, the Revolution released a good deal of unsuspected ability in the Russian masses as it extended education and opportunity. But it also imposed a harsh discipline on the individual, supposedly in the collective interest. Only the present unparalleled war has claimed more victims than the first years of social upheaval and civil war and the later rigors of the First Five Year Plan and the subsequent purges.

Assuming that Russia will now enjoy a fairly long period of peaceful development, it will be interesting to see whether the restraints that are justified by defenders of the Soviet system on the ground of acute peril from foreign enemies will be eliminated. Will the cruel system of forced labor and concentration camps be abolished? Will Soviet newspapers and magazines begin to reflect normal differences of opinion and interest? Will genuine checks and balances begin to modify and moderate the totalitarian political and economic organization of the country? Will Soviet citizens be able to mingle on normal social terms with foreigners at home and abroad without being afraid of denunciation as spies and saboteurs? The answers to these and similar questions will be important not only to Russians, but to the entire world in which the Soviet Union seems destined, after the war, to play such a prominent rôle.

Church and State in Russian History

BY MICHAEL KARPOVICH

IN the early sixteenth century an acute struggle was going on within the ranks of the Orthodox Church in Muscovy. The immediate issue was the question of church land possession. Like the Western church during the Middle Ages, the Russian Church had accumulated, in the course of the previous centuries of its existence, enormous wealth in land which for the most part belonged to the monasteries. It was against this state of affairs that a small but determined group of church reformers raised the voice of protest. Known as the "Trans-Volga Elders,"¹ the protestants were grouped around the hermitage of Sorsk, a center of ascetic monasticism, highly respected for the purity of life and the devotional zeal of its members. They had for leader a remarkable man—Nilus of Sorsk, himself an ascetic and a mystic, a man of deep convictions and of a great strength of character. The Trans-Volga Elders, who also were referred to as the "noncovetous" monks, loudly called upon the church to give up its worldly possessions in order to achieve the Christian ideal of poverty and humility. In their eyes, a truly monastic life and management of big land estates were fundamentally incompatible.

On the other side stood the so-called "Josephites," by far the larger of the two groups, and one that enjoyed the support of the church hierarchy. To them the material wealth of the church was one of the indispensable conditions for the proper performance of its functions. The head of this faction, Joseph of Volokolamsk (hence the name of the Josephites) was the abbot of one of the richest and most influential monasteries in Muscovy. Throughout the sixteenth century this monastery played the part of a "nursery of bishops," and many of the most prominent hierarchs of the period had received their training there. Profoundly different from Nilus of Sorsk in character and outlook, Joseph too was a remarkable man, in his own

¹The term "Elder" was used in Russia to designate a peculiar type of religious authority, exercised by a man (usually a monk) in virtue of his personal saintliness and wisdom, and irrespective of his rank or age.

way. An outstanding church administrator, he defended the retention by the monasteries of their land possessions on purely utilitarian grounds. One of his typical arguments was that the poor monasteries could not attract the better class of people, and these were needed for the building up of an educated and influential hierarchy.

Behind this controversy over the problem of church lands lay a more fundamental difference between two distinct religious types. The Josephites stood for a strict adherence to tradition, emphasized the importance of the ritual and were inclined towards a literal interpretation of religious texts. The followers of Nilus represented the spiritual trend in Russian Christianity, assigning first place to personal piety and assuming a much more liberal attitude towards the dogma and tradition.

Of particular importance was the difference between the two groups with regard to the problem of Church and State relationship. The Josephites wanted the Russian Church to be in an intimate and indissoluble alliance with the State. Preaching a doctrine of absolute loyalty to the secular power, they expected in return a full measure of state support and protection for the Church. In particular, they did not hesitate to invoke the assistance of the secular arm in the suppression of heresies. The Trans-Volga Elders differed sharply from the Josephites on this point. With a degree of tolerance surprising for their time, they rejected compulsion in matters of faith. Those who strayed away from the path of true Christianity should be brought back by persuasion, not by force. The realm of the Church, unlike that of the State, was one of spirit, and in the solution of its problems only spiritual methods could be used. Therefore, it would be better for the State not to interfere with the Church, just as the clergy should refrain from interfering in politics.

The Russian government of the period was bound to be vitally interested in this controversy within the Church. It was particularly concerned with the problem of church lands. Precisely at that time the Moscow rulers were engaged in reorganizing the system of national defense in their dominions. The new system was based on the principle of military service in return for land grants, and the government needed a sufficiently large land fund at its disposal. This is why it viewed the growth of church landownership with some alarm, and why at times it even contemplated secularization of church estates. With regard to this issue the government found itself in agreement with the followers of Nilus of Sorsk who, as is known, demanded the voluntary relinquishment by the church of its worldly

possessions. And yet it could not enter into an alliance with the Trans-Volga Elders because of the other tenets held by that group. The spirit of individual freedom in which they approached the religious problems, their liberal attitude towards those deviating from Orthodoxy, and, above all, their endeavor to protect the Church from state interference and control, were hardly compatible with the centralizing and absolutist tendencies of the rising Russian autocracy. On the contrary, the government was in full sympathy with the traditionalism of the Josephites, their strict adherence to Orthodoxy, and, in particular, their advocacy of a close alliance between Church and State.

And so, a sort of unwritten concordat was concluded between the Moscow government and the leading faction of the Russian Church. For the time being, the government gave up its plan of secularizing the church estates,² limiting itself to enacting legislation that tended to prevent their further growth, and in return it received the unqualified allegiance of the church hierarchy. With governmental support, the opposition movement within the Church was effectively silenced, and the Josephites achieved a complete victory over their antagonists. Under their leadership, the Orthodox Church finally became, by the middle of the sixteenth century, the official national Church of Russia, thus winning a position that it was destined to hold until the Revolution of 1917.

II

At that time the Russian Church already had over five centuries of existence behind it. In the course of this long period it played a great and creative part in the history of Russian culture and the State. Not only did it control the spiritual life of the people, being the only educational agency in the country, but it also became the chief guardian and exponent of the slowly growing idea of national unity. When, in the later part of the Middle Ages, the princes of Moscow undertook the political unification of Russia, it was the Church that rendered them the most determined and particularly effective support. It contributed to the rise of the Tsardom of Moscow by lending it its own moral prestige and, in the persons of some of its outstanding representatives, it took a direct part in the

²The secularization was largely achieved, by degrees, in the course of the eighteenth century, and from that time on the Russian Church possessed only a small fraction of its former landed wealth.

work of national consolidation. Moreover, it supplied the young Russian monarchy with a ready-made theory of divinely ordained royal absolutism which it borrowed from its spiritual parent, the Church of the Byzantine Empire.

One could expect that in virtue of this contribution the Church would emerge an equal partner in the alliance between Church and State in Russia. And yet, in reality, almost from the outset the Church became a subordinate member of the alliance, with the State firmly retaining full measure of control. In a large degree, the very nature of political theories preached by the clergy was responsible for such a result. True, in Byzantium there existed a doctrine which emphasized the equality of the spiritual and the secular power and envisaged a harmonious balance between the two, and that doctrine, too, found its way into Russia. But on the whole the main tradition of the Byzantine Empire was that of the imperial domination over the Church, and it was this tradition that was particularly familiar to the Russian hierarchs. At any rate, neither in Byzantium nor in Russia did the Church as a whole ever exhibit either a strong tendency to assert the supremacy of the spiritual power over the secular, or such a tenacity in defending itself against the encroachments of the State as were characteristic of the Roman Catholic Church in the West.

Of even greater importance were, perhaps, the specific conditions of Russia's historical development. In comparison with the relatively slow progress of royal absolutism in Western Europe, the Russian autocracy succeeded in establishing itself in a surprisingly short period of time. It arose in the process of a rapid territorial expansion of the Tsardom of Moscow, under the constant pressure of foreign menace, and it consolidated its position within the country before any of its potential domestic rivals could become strong enough to successfully challenge its supremacy. Unlike Western European absolutism, the rising Russian monarchy did not have to face either a fully developed and firmly established feudal system, or (after the early fall of the city-republic of Novgorod) any strong and prosperous urban communes. The Russian Church merely shared the fate of other social forces in the country. In spite of its riches and its privileges, it too had not developed into an independent feudal body, and in the end, it succumbed under the sway of the Tsar's autocratic power in the same way as did the other social groups and organizations.

In the early centuries of its existence the Russian Church remained in canonical dependence on the mother Church in Byzantium, and

its head had to be appointed or at least confirmed in office by the Patriarch of Constantinople. Gradually, however, this dependence grew weaker and weaker, and since the destruction of the Byzantine Empire by the Turks in 1453, the Russian Church, to all practical purposes, became an independent national Church. This independence was given formal sanction with the elevation, in 1589, of the Russian Metropolitan to the dignity of the Patriarch of Moscow, recognized as an equal by the other Eastern Patriarchs. In the process of this gradual emancipation from canonical dependence on Constantinople, the practice was established of electing first the Metropolitan and then the Patriarch of Moscow at a Russian Church council. Theoretically, the Church was free in the choice of its head, but there is enough evidence to show that from the outset the elections were controlled by the State. It became customary to submit the names of the candidates for the Tsar's preliminary approval.

No wonder, therefore, that as a rule the Patriarch was not and could not feel himself to be the Tsar's equal. During the whole seventeenth century, there were only two cases when it was otherwise, but both these cases can be viewed as exceptions proving the rule.

The first of these cases was that of Patriarch Philaret (1619-33) who was the virtual co-regent with Tsar Michael (the first of the Romanovs) and was officially recognized as such. But, in addition to his outstanding ability and personal prestige, Philaret owed his exalted position to the fact that he was the Tsar's father. Two decades later a similar position was attained by Patriarch Nikon who, for a while, also acted as the Tsar's co-regent and was given the use of the sovereign title. This time the exaltation of the Patriarch was due to the remarkable ascendancy that Nikon had succeeded in gaining over the mind of Tsar Alexis. Nikon, however, began to lose ground the moment he ceased to enjoy the personal favor of the Tsar. Significantly, the cause of his ruin was precisely his uncompromising insistence on the prerogatives of his office, in which, in the opinion of the Tsar, he overstepped the boundaries of the permissible. Practically alone of all the Russian hierarchs, Nikon attempted to advance in Russia the medieval Western doctrine of the supremacy of the spiritual over the secular power, but in this he was not supported by the Church. Finally he was deposed by a church council and died in disgrace. His fall might be viewed as a prelude to the final subordination of the Russian Church to the State, which took place in the reign of Peter the Great.

III

In the light of the previous development, Peter's ecclesiastical reform appears less revolutionary than it might seem at first glance. It was a consummation of a long historical process rather than a sudden break with the past. It consisted in a thorough reorganization of the central administration of the Church. The office of the Patriarch was abolished, and its place was taken by an ecclesiastical body called the Synod (established in 1721), the members of which, subsequently always chosen from among the bishops, were appointed by and responsible to the government. To watch over the interests of the state, a lay official, known as the High Procurator (*Ober Prokuror*), was attached to the Synod, and in the course of time he became the real master of the church administration.

The political intent of the reform was unmistakable: Peter was aiming at the elimination of the very possibility of a parallel authority in the State. In his opinion, an ambitious and able Patriarch, enjoying great personal prestige, could present a potential danger to the unity of imperial control while, with the Patriarch replaced by a Synod, the government could be sure of retaining this control unimpaired. Under the new organization, church affairs could be managed in the same way as any other branch of governmental business.

The synodal period in the history of the Russian Church, which lasted until the Revolution of 1917, has usually been described as a period of the Church's complete decline. It has been asserted that, in the course of the last two centuries before the Revolution, the Russian Church had degenerated into a subservient tool in the hands of the government, devoid of any inner vitality, and into a privileged body, which could maintain its outwardly predominant position only with state support and protection.

While unfortunately there is an element of truth in these assertions, they cannot be accepted without reservations. To begin with, the indisputable weakening of the Church in the modern period of Russian history cannot be ascribed fully to the change in its organization. With or without the Patriarch at its head, the Church was bound to lose some of its former power and influence. It had entered the modern period greatly weakened by the schism which had been caused in its ranks by Nikon's reform of the church ritual and the revision of prayer books and other religious texts. The schism resulted in the permanent secession of millions of the so-called Old Believers who refused to accept the "Nikonian innovations," and among whom there were many of the most devout and zealous

church members. The Church also was losing many of its members to the various religious sects which, beginning with the eighteenth century, were meeting with considerable success among the popular masses of Russia. Simultaneously, the rapid westernization of the upper groups of society and the corresponding secularization of Russian culture led to the loss by the Church of its former exclusive influence in the intellectual life of the country. Before long, an indifferent, if not a hostile, attitude towards religion became a common phenomenon among the educated class.

It would be a grave historical error, however, to assume that because of these circumstances the Church ceased to be an important factor in Russian life and culture. To a large degree, it succeeded in retaining its hold over the soul of the nation. In spite of all its weaknesses and shortcomings, it remained a depository of spiritual forces deeply rooted in national consciousness and tradition. There was still a genuine Christian piety among the millions of Orthodox believers, and the Church still had many worthy servitors in its ranks. Even during the synodal period of its history, the Russian Church possessed some important centers of religious learning and of earnest spiritual endeavor. And the rich heritage of Orthodox religious thought and art still could serve as a source of inspiration. Gogol, Dostoevsky, and Leskov, among the outstanding nineteenth-century writers, the thinkers of the Slavophil school, the philosopher Vladimir Soloviev, the idealists and the mystics of the early twentieth century—none of these cultural phenomena would have been possible outside the great Orthodox tradition. Many modern Russian composers and painters also borrowed from the same source.

The conventional idea of the Church and State relationship, during the modern period of Russian history, also stands in need of revision. The extent of the state control over the life of the Church, as a rule, has been greatly exaggerated. The situation has been often described as one of "caesaropapism." The term, I believe, is a misleading one. It implies that the Tsar occupied in the Russian Orthodox Church the same position that in the Roman Catholic Church belonged to the Pope. Such, obviously, was not the case. The Tsar never had the doctrinal power of the Pope nor was he a bishop of the church endowed with the so-called "power of order." His only ecclesiastical power was that of jurisdiction, and even this was of an indirect supervising nature. True, the Law of Imperial Succession, promulgated by Emperor Paul in the end of the eighteenth century, spoke of the Russian sovereign as the "head of the Church." But subsequently this was interpreted by the Fundamental Laws to mean

that the Emperor was "the supreme defender and protector of the dogmas of the Orthodox faith, the guardian of Orthodoxy and of all good order in the Holy Church." As a matter of fact, no Russian Tsar ever legislated in matters of dogma or ritual. No articles of faith and no prayer books were ever passed or approved by the imperial government.³

Neither was the pre-revolutionary Russian Church such a highly privileged body as it has been so often pictured. As pointed out above, most of its estates had been secularized in the course of the eighteenth century, and on the eve of the Revolution its wealth was by no means excessive. The financial support it received from the government was insufficient to cover its expenses, and the parish priests, in particular, were maintained almost exclusively by payment for ministrations. The rank and file of the clergy were of democratic origin, and were forced to live in very modest circumstances. Contrary to a widespread opinion, pre-revolutionary Russia was not a priest-ridden country, and in proportion to the total population, the number of clergy was far from being unreasonably high. In fact, one of the serious problems the Church had to face a few years before the Revolution was the actual scarcity of priests.⁴

While representing the official state religion of the Russian Empire, the Orthodox Church did not enjoy a complete monopoly of spiritual guidance of the country. The law recognized the existence of other denominations, and some of them, like the Roman Catholic and the Lutheran Churches, for instance, though somewhat discriminated against, on the whole were guaranteed normal conditions of religious life. The situation was worse with regard to the so-called "sectarians" and, in a lesser degree, the Old Believers. But even here periods of persecution alternated with those of a more liberal attitude. A considerable improvement was introduced by the Decree on Religious Toleration, promulgated in 1905, on the eve of the constitutional régime. But one can say that even before this welcome change, all the religious denominations in imperial Russia enjoyed far greater freedom of action than subsequently was allowed any of them by the religious policy of the Soviet government.

³In this respect, the English government certainly was more "caesaropapist" than the Russian.

⁴For factual corroboration, I refer the reader to *Church and State in Russia: The Last Years of the Empire, 1900-1917*, by John S. Curtiss, a book highly critical of the pre-revolutionary Russian Church.

IV

The fall of the imperial régime opened a new chapter in the history of the Russian Church. The new Provisional government of Russia proclaimed the principles of freedom of conscience and of religious toleration, and began taking the first steps towards a complete secularization of the Russian State. Simultaneously, a reform movement within the Church itself resulted in the convocation of a Church council (the first to meet since the seventeenth century) with the purpose of reestablishing the Patriarchate and reorganizing the life of the Church in accordance with new conditions. To be sure, there was no complete accord between the Provisional government, on the one hand, and the leading church circles which dominated the council, on the other. While the former was moving in the direction of a complete separation of Church and State, the latter apparently envisaged for the Church a status similar to that which the Roman Catholic Church had in France under the Napoleonic concordat. There was no reason, however, to expect that this difference would lead to a sharp conflict, and hope could be entertained for the establishment in Russia of normal and mutually beneficial relations between Church and State. Before these hopes could be realized, however, the Provisional government was engulfed by the second revolutionary wave, and the Church, with the newly elected Patriarch at its head, had to face the new Soviet régime, with its openly professed hostility to religion in general and to the Russian Orthodox Church in particular.

The general history of the Church under the Soviet régime does not enter into the scope of this article.⁵ Here I limit myself to the discussion of the Church and State relationship. Officially, the situation as it became established under the Soviet régime has been described as separation of Church and State, and this description has been uncritically accepted and spread abroad by many foreign writers. In reality, this is as misleading as the term "caesaropapism" so often used with reference to pre-revolutionary Russia. Under the system of separation of Church and State, the State does not patronize or associate itself with any of the religious denominations existing within its boundaries, but it maintains an attitude of benevolent neutrality towards all of them, and it guarantees to each of them freedom of activity and conditions of normal life. It is quite

⁵For a brief account, see N. S. Timasheff's article, "The Church in the Soviet Union, 1917-1941" in *The Russian Review*, Vol. I, No. 1.

obvious that such a state of affairs did not exist in Soviet Russia. Instead of benevolent neutrality, the State assumed an attitude of open hostility to all and every religion—a hostility that for years was expressed in acts of direct persecution and discrimination. As a matter of fact, the government associated itself with the militant anti-religious creed of various atheist organizations, to which it gave full measure of support, thus making atheism a kind of state religion in Russia.

Moreover, even in so far as the Church was tolerated, it was by no means guaranteed normal existence or given that amount of freedom for its activities which it is customary to find under the system of the separation of Church and State. Even by the letter of the Soviet constitution, the only freedom that the Church possessed was that of worship. It had no right to engage in any missionary activity or even to defend itself against hostile attacks, while the freedom of anti-religious propaganda was specifically mentioned in the constitution. It had no right to maintain schools of its own or to organize religious instruction in any form whatsoever, while the teaching of atheism was introduced into the state-controlled schools. Needless to say, the Church could not have its own press, and could not publish any religious literature. At the same time it was specifically prohibited from engaging in any social activities such as organizing youth clubs or mutual aid and charitable societies. It should be kept in mind that all these limitations were applied equally to every religious denomination in the country.

As far as the Orthodox Church was concerned, its freedom of action was greatly impeded still in another way. The law recognized individual parishes only, treating them as private groups of believers who could register with the local authorities and ask for permission to use church buildings as places of worship. But it did not recognize the Church as a national body, and it simply ignored its hierarchical structure. One can easily see what this meant to the bishops in their dioceses and to the central church authority in Moscow. They had to lead a precarious existence, having no rights guaranteed by law and being able to exercise their functions only in the measure in which that was tolerated by the government. Moreover, after the death in 1925 of Patriarch Tikhon, the government refused to permit the Church to hold a council for the election of his successor. For almost two decades thereafter the Church was headed by a *locum tenens* who again did not have an officially recognized status, and who repeatedly, and for a long time vainly, tried to obtain from the government legalization of his administration.

Since the late 1930's, the situation of the Church in the Soviet Union began to improve due to a more conciliatory policy on the part of the government. Direct persecution of the clergy and the believers was discontinued, and some of the worst features of the discrimination against the Church also were abandoned. Simultaneously, militant atheism ceased to be the official governmental policy, and its manifestations even were discouraged, in an apparent effort to placate the believers. Dictated by a desire to consolidate national sentiment in the country in the face of a growing foreign menace, this "new religious policy" was greatly strengthened by the actual outbreak of the war. In this national crisis, the Church unhesitatingly took a strong patriotic stand, and, as if in recompense for this loyalty, the government went a step further in its policy of reconciliation. By permitting the convocation of the council⁶ at which the *locum tenens* Metropolitan Sergius was elected Patriarch, the government finally recognized the existence of the national church administration.

The importance of this act should not be either minimized or exaggerated. It undoubtedly represents a great improvement over the previous state of affairs, but it is still far from fulfilling all of the Church's legitimate demands and aspirations. Latest news from Russia tells of the projected opening of a Theological Academy in Moscow, and of schools for the training of priests in the dioceses. But it remains to be seen whether the Church will obtain that degree of freedom which is required for the proper performance of its fundamental functions.

A good deal will depend, of course, on the inner vitality of the Church and the strength of its prestige with the Russian people. It seems that the Orthodox Church has emerged from the period of persecutions with its spiritual force unimpaired and perhaps even strengthened. It seems also that by associating itself with the struggle for Russia's integrity and independence, it succeeded in regaining a position of importance in national life. But that alone is not sufficient to guarantee its normal development in the future. For the Church to be able to realize its creative possibilities, a radical change in the Church and State relationship in Russia is needed. And this, in turn, is not likely to happen until certain general conditions prevail in the country. I do not know of any better way of summing up these conditions than by using the famous formula of Cavour. What is to be hoped for in Russia, is "a free Church in a free State."

⁶Unlike the council of 1917, in which both the clergy and the laity were fully represented, the council of 1943 was a council of bishops.

The Federal Organization of the U.S.S.R.

BY JOHN N. HAZARD

FOREIGN Commissar Molotov's speech at the February first meeting of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. caught the attention of the world.¹ The sixteen Union republics forming the U.S.S.R. were to be granted new powers through an amendment to the 1936 constitution.² It is the purpose of this article to examine the federal organization of the U.S.S.R. and to place the change in the setting of this organization.

The republics which form the U.S.S.R. have not always been federated. They arose independently, like the American states, and are of varying origins. The oldest among them emerged from the chaos of civil war and intervention following the last world war. The newest among them have arisen from the present conflict. Their people differ in language and sometimes in racial characteristics, for each has arisen within boundaries which are ethnic in origin. Each represents a different culture, and each has preserved its ethnic differences. Nevertheless, there is to be found in each republic a political development which presented striking similarity even before federation occurred.

Similarity of political development can be traced, in large measure, to the fact that there has been a common denominator for all republics. Leaders have been united in their determination to build a new economy upon the base of state ownership of the means of production and distribution—the land, mines, forests, waters, industry, and means of communication and trade. There has also been common to the leaders of each republic a political philosophy based upon Marxist theories of government and membership in the Communist Party, as well as the experience of the revolutions of 1905 and 1917.³

¹For text, see *New York Times*, Feb. 2, 1944, p. 10.

²For text of the amendment, see *New York Times*, Feb. 3, 1944, p. 5.

³For a statement of this philosophy as it concerns the national minority question, see Joseph Stalin, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, New York, International Publishers, 1935.

This common bond of training and experience among the leaders has provided the link between the republics as they framed their constitutions. The strength of this bond is evidenced in the close similarity of constitutional development in each ethnic group. A glance at the historical development of the republics and the steps leading to federation will emphasize these factors.⁴

First to appear as a Soviet Socialist Republic was the Russian ethnic group, which organized itself in the major part of the old Empire. On July 10, 1918, this group adopted its constitution. It called itself a federation, since the Russian ethnic group covered a vast area, which was also the home of numerous ethnic minorities. The federal structure was not reflected in the constitution, however.⁵ It developed later as the ethnic minorities became organized as "Autonomous Republics," with broad cultural autonomy, but close integration of administrative activity with the mother republic, which adopted the name of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.⁶

In 1919, as their territories of the old Empire were freed from invading armies, the Ukrainian and White Russian Soviet Socialist Republics emerged. In 1921, the Azerbaidjan Soviet Socialist Republic adopted a constitution, to be followed in 1922 by the Armenian and Georgian Soviet Socialist Republics. All of these five republics followed the pattern of the constitution adopted by the Russian group.

A variation in the pattern appeared in 1922, when the Central Asiatic areas of Bokhara and Khorezm declared themselves Soviet People's Republics and made no provision that socialism was to be the economic base for society. These areas were mainly raw material producing areas without the industrial core Marxists believe essential for the development of a socialist economy.

Need for close relations with the economically and politically

⁴For the details of this progression, see the author's "The Soviet Constitution: An Introduction," *Lawyers Guild Review*, Nov.-Dec., 1943.

⁵For a translation of the text of the Constitution, see Rappard et al., *Source Book on European Governments*, N. Y., Van Nostrand, 1937.

⁶The first Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic was formed in 1919 by the Bashkirs, who were followed in 1920 by the Tatar and the Khirgiz peoples. In 1921 there were added the Turkestan, Abkhazian, Adzharian, Crimean, and Dagestan Republics. The development thereafter was slower until recent years. The total is now fifteen within the R.S.F.S.R.

strongest republic, the R.S.F.S.R., began to be felt by the other republics as early as January 26, 1919, when the temporary government of the Ukraine raised the question of exchanging materials with the R.S.F.S.R. In May, 1919, the Ukrainian Republic's Central Executive Committee issued a decree directing that military operations be carried on against the common enemy in cooperation with all existing Soviet republics. In January, 1920, the Ukrainian Republic extended the laws of the R.S.F.S.R. to its own territory in so far as they related to transport, posts, telegraph, military organization, production, labor, and social insurance.

The White Russian Republic voted to send delegates to meetings of the Congress of Soviets of the R.S.F.S.R. and to unite its Commissariats in the same year, and the Azerbaidjan Republic made the same decision in April, 1920.

Closer union was effected in 1920 and 1921, when the R.S.F.S.R. concluded a series of treaties with the other republics on economic and governmental questions requiring united action, and merging the Commissariats of military and naval affairs, foreign trade, finance, labor, communications, posts and telegraph, and the Supreme Council of National Economy. To the economic and military union the republics added diplomatic coordination in 1922, when it became necessary to send delegates to the All-European Economic Congress. The task of representing the various republics at the Congress was transferred to the R.S.F.S.R. in a Protocol executed by representatives of the Azerbaidjan, Armenian, White Russian, Bokhara, Khorezm, Georgian, and Ukrainian Republics as well as the Far Eastern Republic, which had been created in the interim along the Pacific coast of Siberia.

With the completion of these steps, the various republics had combined their economic and military strength and had even provided for a close political relationship, unusual among states which continued to preserve political autonomy.

Formal union was approved in principle by a Congress of delegates from each republic on December 30, 1922. A constitution for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was not finally approved, however, until January 31, 1924. The republics forming the new Union were four—the R.S.F.S.R., the Ukrainian and White Russian Soviet Socialist Republics and the Transcaucasian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic. This latter was formed by the Azerbaidjan, Georgian and Armenian Republics on December 13, 1922, in anticipation of the creation of the U.S.S.R. The Bokhara and Khorezm Peoples Republics remained outside of the Union at this time.

Federation involved the transfer to the Union government of the exclusive right to conclude treaties and conduct diplomatic relations, declare war, coin money, establish a union citizenship, settle disputes between republics, establish postal services, and establish a standard of weights and measures. The socialist base of society was secured in all republics by placing in the Union government the power to develop a general plan for the entire national economy, to establish general principles for the development and use of soil, mineral deposits, forests and bodies of water, and to direct transport and telegraph services and foreign trade.

The right to secede was preserved for each constituent republic, although each had to amend its constitution and its laws to conform to the principles of the federal constitution and federal law as long as it remained a part of the Union. Budgets of the republics were incorporated in the federal budget, and local taxes had to be approved by the federal government.

Although principles of criminal and civil legislation were to be set by the federal government as well as basic labor laws, the actual promulgation of codes of laws remained the province of each republic. Bills of rights remained the subject of republic action as did control over the franchise. The federal constitution of 1924 had no provisions covering these subjects.

To provide an equal measure of representation to each republic, the Central Executive Committee of the Congress of Soviets was made bi-cameral. This legislative body had a chamber in which each constituent republic had equal representation, and approval of this chamber was required before a law proposed by the chamber representing citizens by population alone could be enacted.

Executive functions of the federal government and the republics were integrated by the creation of two classes of Commissariats: (a) All-Union and (b) Federated. The All-Union Commissariats administered foreign affairs, army and navy matters, foreign trade, communications, and posts and telegraphs. These Commissariats had their main office in the capital of the Union and branch offices in the capitals of each republic. Orders went from the main office to the branch and could be sent directly without reference to the government of the republic.

The Federated Commissariats preserved a large measure of influence for the republics. They were organized to handle agriculture, labor, finance, inspection (auditing) and included the Supreme Council of National Economy. The structure differed from that of the All-Union Commissariats. There was a Commissariat in the cap-

ital of the Union, responsible only to the government of the Union, but there was also a Commissariat of like name in the republic with dual responsibility:—to the government of the republic and to the Commissariat created by the government of the Union. This organizational pattern provided for a central coordinating and planning agency in the Union, while each republic had an operating agency over which it shared control with the central agency. Republics also had their own Commissariats which had no responsibility to the Union government. These handled local industry, municipal economy, education, and social insurance. In these questions the republics were supreme as long as they did not run counter to the national plans. As will be seen later, this pattern has been extended by the 1936 Constitution and is the subject of the amendment recently adopted.

The 1924 Constitution placed upon the Supreme Court of the Union certain powers and duties regarding the republics. The Court might interpret federal legislation to the republics and might review any decision, order or judgment of a Supreme Court of a republic, if the Public Prosecutor of the Union requested the review. It could not set aside a law of the republic or a decision of courts of a republic, however. It could only advise the Central Executive Committee of the Congress of Soviets of its findings, which might then act, leaving the republic to secede if it felt the decision important enough.

Between the 1924 Constitution and the 1936 Constitution, several new republics entered the Union. The Bokhara and Khorezm Peoples' Republics in Central Asia adopted a program of state ownership of means of production and petitioned the Union for admittance as the Uzbek and Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republics. They were admitted in 1924, although the act of the Central Executive Committee of the Union was not ratified until 1925 by the Congress of Soviets. The Tadzhik Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic became a Union Republic and was admitted in 1929. In 1936, the Transcaucasian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic was dissolved and the three component parts of Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaidjan became Union Republics. The total number of Union Republics was brought to eleven at the same time by the admission of the Kazakh and Kirgiz Soviet Socialist Republics.

The 1936 Constitution⁷ of the Union expanded the influence of

⁷For translation of the text with amendments to 1943, see editions published by the American-Russian Institute and The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, New York, 1943.

the Union government, although the right of a Union Republic to secede was specifically enumerated. It was even the subject of special attention at the Congress called to consider the draft. Stalin said that the right must have meaning. He stated that an ethnic group must number at least a million persons and be located on a border with the outside world so that if secession were decided upon, it could actually be exercised, and so that the people would be numerous enough to provide some assurance that if they seceded, they would not be absorbed by another power against their will.

Rights of the republics were safeguarded in the legislative body in much the same way as before, in that the Supreme Soviet was made bi-cameral. One chamber was composed of twenty-five representatives from each Union republic, regardless of its size, and a smaller number from other ethnic groups. These representatives were elected directly by the people of the republic, rather than indirectly through an intervening body selected on the basis of population alone, as had been the case under the 1924 Constitution.

Administrative structure as it related to the republics was much the same as in the 1924 Constitution. The Commissariats acting without reference to the republics were called "All-Union Commissariats," while the Commissariats organized on the pattern formerly called "Federated" were called "Union-Republics." Some Commissariats were transferred from one class to another, and numerous ones were added by dividing the work of previously existing Commissariats.

According to the 1936 Constitution and its amendments, the All-Union Commissariats, prior to the 1944 amendment, were the following: Defense, Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade, Railways, Post and Telegraph and Telephones, Maritime Transport, River Transport, Coal Industry, Oil Industry, Power Stations, Electrical Industry, Iron and Steel Industry, Non-Ferrous Metallurgy, Chemical Industry, Aviation Industry, Shipbuilding Industry, Munitions, Armaments, Heavy Machine Building, Tank Industry, Mortar Armament, Navy, Agricultural Procurement, Construction, Cellulose Industry, Machine Tool Industry, and Rubber Industry.

The Union Republic Commissariats prior to the 1944 amendment were the following: Food Industry, Fish Industry, Meat and Dairy Industry, Light Industry, Textile Industry, Timber Industry, Agriculture, State Grain and Livestock Farms, Finance, Trade, Internal Affairs, Justice, Public Health, Building Materials Industry, and State Control. In these cases, the Union government does the planning, and the republics carry out the plans through the Com-

missariat concerned.

Certain activities are reserved entirely for the republics, acting through their own Commissariats, which are responsible solely to the government of the republic. These act in the field of education, local industry, municipal economy, social insurance, and automobile transport. The central government maintains certain planning and control functions in these fields by constituting the State Planning Commission, the State Control Commission, the Committee for Higher Schools, the Committee on Art, and the Administration of the State Bank.

The new amendment adopted on February 1, 1944, transfers the Commissariats of Foreign Affairs and Defense from the All-Union group of Commissariats to the Union-Republic group of Commissariats. By doing so, operational functions are given the republics, but subject to the designation by the Union government of the general principles under which they are to act.

The Union government retains the power to represent itself in international relations and to conclude and ratify treaties. The Union government also retains the power to organize the defense of the Union and to direct all armed forces of the Union. The republics obtain the specific right to enter into direct relations with foreign states, to conclude agreements and exchange diplomatic and consular representation with them, and to create military formations of the republic, but only subject to the directing principles established by the Union.

If the custom developed in the case of other Union-Republic Commissariats, such as that for Justice, is followed, the new Union Republic Commissariats of Foreign Affairs and Defense will retain in the Commissariat of the Union government a staff of experts who determine policy and even supervise its execution in the republics and abroad and will develop in the Commissariats of the republics staffs of operating personnel who perform the tasks set by the Commissariat of the Union government. The relationship will not be one-sided, however, if previous experience with other Commissariats constitutes a precedent. The operating people will hold joint meetings with members of the staff of the Commissariat of the Union government. In these meetings policies will be explained and suggestions will be received by the federal authorities. Criticism of a constructive nature will be severe. The planners will receive distinct advice on how their policies work out in action, and they will be expected to consider these practical situations in future planning.

In spite of increased powers for republics, there are strong forces

acting for the federal government. The 1936 Constitution strengthened the office of the State Prosecutor. He is named by the Union government and names in turn the State Prosecutors in the republics, which have no control over the activities of the Prosecutors. The Prosecutor's Office has become a unifying force, reaching into every republic and being charged with the task of making certain that laws of the Union are observed.

The right to promulgate criminal and civil codes was transferred from the control of the republics by the 1936 Constitution to the Union government. Although jurists immediately began to prepare drafts, they were never adopted, due perhaps to the advent of the war. Each republic, therefore, retains its own civil and criminal codes which are in accord with general principles enunciated by the Union government and which also incorporate federal laws. They are still, however, formally legislation of the republic and have some points of variation.

The court system remains essentially an organization of each republic. The Supreme Court of the Union has supervisory jurisdiction over the courts of the republics. It is also the pinnacle of a system of lower federal courts, which have jurisdiction over offenses concerning national defense, railway transport, and water transport. Only the Supreme Soviet of the Union may set aside a law of a republic if it is thought to contravene a federal law or the constitution. The Supreme Court has no such power and no longer has the expressed function of advising the Supreme Soviet on such matters, although there is nothing to prevent the Supreme Soviet from asking for such advice.

Control over the franchise and the basic rights and duties of the citizen was transferred from the republics to the Union government in 1936 by the incorporation of provisions relating to these important matters governing the life of every citizen. Republics thereafter had to comply with the principles set forth by the Union constitution or secede. Republics retained in the 1936 Constitution the right to independent citizenship as granted by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic, but since granting of citizenship in a republic automatically gives citizenship in the Union, the republic must comply with the federal law of 1938 on the subject of citizenship in the Union.

Since the outbreak of the present European war, five new republics have been admitted to the Union as Union Republics, bringing the total members of the Union to sixteen. These entered in 1940, under the names: Karelian-Finnish, Moldavian, Lithuanian, Lat-

vian, and Esthonian. Parts of former Poland have been added to the Union republics of the Ukraine and White Russia.

This article has been concerned with Union Republics and their relationship to the Federal government. It has touched upon the "Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics" only briefly. These republics are organized within the Union republics and have no right to secede. Their powers are somewhat similar to those of a Union republic, except that they have no right to create a citizenship for their inhabitants, they may not enact labor laws, and they may not grant amnesties. They have representatives in the Soviet of Nationalities of the U.S.S.R., however, although these representatives are fewer in number than those elected by each Union republic.

The Communist Party remains a unifying force throughout all republics. Although the constitution of the Union and the constitutions of the republics contain no statement that other parties may not be formed, those familiar with the Marxian concept that parties represent classes and with the recital of the constitution to the effect that antagonistic classes no longer exist in the U.S.S.R. appreciate that other political parties are not to be expected. Stalin said as much to Roy Howard on March 1, 1936, in the following words, "But since there are no classes, since the dividing lines between classes have been obliterated, since only a slight, but not a fundamental difference between various strata in socialist society has remained, there can be no soil for the creation of contending parties." In the same interview, however, Stalin said that candidates might be put forward by public non-Party organizations so that the absence of contending parties is not expected to prevent election contests. This system seems to assure that throughout all political activity in the Union or in the republics, the basic economic and political principles of the Party will not be presented for public approval or rejection through the ballot box. They and the Party by which they have been adopted will stand as the cement of the Union, the institution and the principles to which the peoples of the republics will look for guidance.

The amendment of February, 1944, has introduced new responsibilities for the republics of the Union, but the power of the federal government remains strong. It is still the principal planning and policy making agency, and in many fields, it is the operating agency as well. It remains to be seen whether the reversal of the direction of the 1936 Constitution toward closer federation will develop into a trend toward the restoration of other powers to the republics.

Russian Names For American Towns

BY ALBERT PARRY

THE melting pot that it truly is, America has early and late chosen foreign names for its towns and hamlets. We have heard and read amusing quips about Paris, Texas; Berlin, Connecticut; Athens, Georgia; and Moscow, Idaho. Certainly there is more than a funny anecdote behind each rural American community bearing the proud name of a European capital. There is bound to be an interesting and instructive tale in the history of such quaint baptizing of a New World settlement. Let others investigate the origin of French and German and Greek and what-have-you town-names in the United States. I set myself the task of investigating the backgrounds of Russian names gracing American communities.

I began with what I already had known ever since my own coming to this country twenty-odd years ago: that in the 1880s a Russian nobleman founded St. Petersburg, in Florida, naming it after his old homeland's capital. He was Petr Alekseyevich Dementyev, in America known as Peter A. Demens, and he signed his numerous articles on America appearing in Russian magazines with the pseudonym "P. A. Tverskoy." His life was adventurous and otherwise varied. Born in 1849, he grew up in riches and idleness, becoming at the threshold of his adult life a privileged officer of the Tsar's Guards. In the 1870s, however, we find him active in the liberal circles of the *Zemstvo* (or local self-government organization) in his native Tver province. He also held the elective office of *predvoditel dvorianstva* (Marshal of Nobility). All this, though, came to a sudden end when, "warned of an impending visit of the gendarmes he fled at night from his own home and with great difficulty crossed the border."¹ The nature of his trouble with the tsarist authorities has never been made wholly clear.

¹M. Vilchur, *Russkie v Amerike* (Russians in America), New York, First Russian Publishing Corporation, 1918, pp. 22-23.

Sailing for America, Dementyev at once chose Florida as the likeliest place to start anew. According to his later reminiscences, his entire fortune consisted of forty dollars, and he had not only himself to support but his wife and children as well. He was thirty at the time; he was strong, cheerful, and energetic, looking back with disgust upon his lazy youth and rich life in Russia. In Florida he began as a farmer, living with his family in a shack on a clearing amid woods near the shores of the Gulf of Mexico. At first they had no help, and Mme. Dementyev did all the housework while her husband sweated in the fields. Presently the ex-nobleman changed to a job as a sawmill hand and in a swift succession of promotions reached a managerial position with a lumber firm.

By the mid-1880s Peter A. Demens had a small lumbering company of his own, and although knowing nothing of railroad construction, he went ahead with much success laying a rail line as he led his lumberjack crews farther and farther south. And so it happened that in 1887 he "built the Orange Belt Railroad into Pinellas Peninsula and named the small village then standing there for his native capital, St. Petersburg."² The St. Petersburg, Florida, Chamber of Commerce gives the year of the arrival of the Orange Belt road as 1888, and tends to credit the foundation of the town not to the Russian but to General John C. Williams, son of Detroit's first mayor, and Michigan's first millionaire. To quote from a mimeographed publicity release mailed to me last October by Mr. C. Murrel, corresponding secretary of the St. Petersburg Chamber of Commerce:

Gov. Williams, prominent in Detroit municipal affairs, was advised by his physician in the late Eighties to seek a warmer climate for relief from asthma. He went to Florida and toured the State seeking the mythical Fountain of Youth. . . . Finally he chose to settle on the long, narrow peninsula on the Gulf, now occupied by the city of St. Petersburg.

Immediately the General set out to establish a new community which he hoped would attract others in search of health and sunshine, first laying out the 100-foot streets which today give St. Petersburg the widest thoroughfares in Florida. A hotel was built and a few homes erected, and in 1888 the Orange Belt railroad, a narrow gauge line, entered the new city.

Not until then was consideration given to the question of naming the small but thriving community.

In a conversation with Petrovitch Demanscheff [sic!], an exiled member of the Russian nobility who built the railroad, Gen. Williams suggested that the city be named Detroit, after his Michigan birthplace.

²Hans v. Briesen, *Why Not Know Florida: An Informal Guide for the Motorist*, Jacksonville, Florida, the Drew Press, 1936, p. 156.

"I would like to name it after my home, St. Petersburg, Russia," said Demenscheff.

"Let's flip a coin," suggested the General.

A silver half-dollar was tossed. Williams lost. But he had the satisfaction of naming St. Petersburg's first hotel. He called it the Detroit, and it still stands today.

By then Dementyev was a Florida landowner and a building contractor of note, and many of the first houses in the new town were of his design. It is probable that the extraordinary broadness of the streets was his, and not Williams', idea—reminding us, as it does, of the width of thoroughfares in the Russian capital founded by Peter the Great. Indeed, although he did have partners in some of his enterprises, Dementyev-Demens-Tverskoy's published reminiscences do not even hint that anyone but himself was responsible for the inception and rise of the Florida town. From the tone of his narrative, it is apparent that at the time the sketches were written—in the early 1890s—it did not occur to their author that his chief rôle in the creation of that city would ever be disputed.³

An unexpected collapse of the initial Florida boom deprived Demens of an opportunity to become an American millionaire—his partners had refused a fabulous offer for their Florida lands from New York capitalists, much to the Russian's disgust and his partners' subsequent regret. The census of 1890 revealed the population of St. Petersburg, Florida, as 273. By that year, however, Peter A. Demens was no longer there: in the spring of 1889 he had moved to Ashville, North Carolina. In 1893, restless as usual, he liquidated many of his California holdings and established his home and numerous businesses in California. For years he was active in the Republican Party, but in 1905 the news of the revolution in Russia brought him back to his fatherland and its politics. In St. Petersburg, Russia, he started *Strana* (The Nation), "an organ of constitutional thought," but within a year had returned to California.⁴

Peter A. Demens once more settled in Los Angeles, and there he lived, well loved in the local Russian colony, until his death in 1919 at the age of seventy. An uncle and two cousins of mine, who became members of that colony shortly after 1905, knew him in this latter period of his life, and now recall Demens fondly.

Two decades after its founder's death, St. Petersburg in Florida

³P. A. Tverskoy, "*Desiat let v Amerike*" (Ten years in America), *Vestnik Evropy*, St. Petersburg, Russia, January-May 1893; and "*Moya zhizn v Amerike*" (My Life in America), *Vestnik Evropy*, January 1894.

⁴Vilchur, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

was
mane
peo
durin
tion
and
Cana
away
Since
free
hims
otic s
TH
burg
been
Bu
Unit
TH
in Id
Univ
overl
try, f
of gr
by a
was,
was,
in lib
Pr
It is
of th
Miss
the c
snow
quite
boast
consi
loadi
schoc
fields

⁵*Id.*
Ltd.,

was shown (by the census of 1940) to have more than 60,000 permanent inhabitants, with a typical tourist influx of some 400,000 people remaining there from one or two weeks to several months during the winter season. "The Sunshine City" is the official appellation of the town, and an extraordinary proportion of the populace and tourists are old men and women from all over the States and Canada seeking their last warmth on earth. A town newspaper gives away its editions free of charge on days when the sun fails to shine. Since 1910, when the practice was first introduced, less than five free issues have marked each year. Such is the monument erected to himself by the Russian founder of St. Petersburg, Florida, on the exotic shores of the Gulf of Mexico!

There are a few other towns in America called either St. Petersburg or Petersburg, but none except the one in Florida seems to have been founded by a Russian in honor of Tsar Peter's city on the Neva.

But it is different with Moscow. There are several of them in the United States, and each one owes its name to Russia's ancient capital.

The largest and best-known Moscow in America is a town of 4,500 in Idaho. The site of old Fort Russell; the seat of the Idaho State University, with its lovely campus of nearly seven hundred acres overlooking Paradise Valley; the heart of the fertile Palouse country, famed for its rich soil of black volcanic ash, producing a wealth of grain and peas, Moscow in Idaho is "said to have been named by a Russian with the unbelievable name of Hogg."⁵ Yet, who Hogg was, whence he had drifted into Idaho, and what his ultimate fate was, all this remains unknown to us, as all my inquiries by mail and in libraries have yielded no results.

Proceeding eastward, we encounter another Moscow in Arkansas. It is close by Pine Bluff in Jefferson County, in the southeastern part of the state near the place where the Arkansas River flows into the Mississippi. This is a land of cotton, and by a stretch of imagination the cotton-white fields in harvest time may remind a traveler of snow-clad Moscow in Russia. Otherwise the countryside is, of course, quite different from a typical Russian landscape. Moscow, Arkansas, boasts of a population of 225 and is but a small cluster of buildings consisting "of little besides a railroad station, a long row of cotton-loading platforms, and a couple of gins, a few stores, a church, a school, and a handful of houses," standing in the midst of "endless fields, bleak brown in winter, green in spring," companion to great

⁵*Idaho, a Guide in Word and Picture*, Caldwell, Idaho, The Caxton Printers, Ltd., 1937, p. 410. Also see pages 306 and 307.

plantations and sharecroppers' huts.⁶

How did the town get its name? In reply to my question Mr. G. D. Long, its postmaster, writes that "Moscow, Arkansas, was named in 1905 by the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, being on that line." He goes on in his letter to say: "There are no Russians in our part of Arkansas, and the oldest settlers here do not know why it was named 'Moscow.' However, we are proud of our name."

A likely explanation is in the railroad officials' memory of an earlier and now abandoned Moscow, named after the Slav city and formerly situated a short distance from the town of Prescott in Nevada County, in the Southwestern section of Arkansas, where fruit is raised and shipped in addition to cotton. There was even a "Battle of Moscow" in America's Civil War taking its name from that older and now extinct town.

The exact circumstances of the naming of this earlier Moscow of Arkansas in honor of the city of the Kremlin have not come down to us—though, of course, I do hope for word from some reader of this article who may have the missing data at his fingertips.

Continuing our trek east, we come to Missouri and its Moscow Mills, a village on a hilltop overlooking the Cuivre River, with a community center occupying one side of a two-story stone house built by Negro slaves in the 1830s. This must have been a planter's mansion, and "its one-time magnificence is indicated by walls 18 inches thick, hand-carved walnut woodwork, and a massive, curved stair rail." The owner, I venture to guess, may have been a world traveler or a well-read person in his day, possibly with some knowledge of, or respect for, the city which was Napoleon's undoing; hence the name.

We are on slightly more positive grounds when, crossing through Missouri's southeastern corner into its neighbor Tennessee, we rest in that state's Moscow. The town clerk of Tennessee's Moscow, Mr. Junius L. Crosset, wrote to me last October:

Moscow is located about 38 miles east of Memphis, Tennessee, in Fayette County, and has about 500 inhabitants, 10 mercantile establishments, two garages and auto sales, one bank, two churches, one school, one hotel, and one restaurant. The town of Moscow, Tennessee, was founded in about 1829, by a company who purchased lands from one William Head, for this purpose. The supposition was that among this

⁶*Arkansas, a Guide to the State, American Guide Series, New York, Hastings House, 1941, p. 277.*

⁷*Missouri, a Guide to the "Show Me" State, American Guide Series, New York, Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1941, p. 447.*

company were some influential people of Russian descent who named the town for their metropolis Moscow in Russia.

In Maryland, the town of Moscow used to be known as Moscow Mills. According to a communication reaching me from Mr. W. H. Malcolm of that place, the town "was named by Mr. A. B. Shaw, who owned a grist mill, a saw mill, and a planing mill, and that name remained until 1920, and then the railroad dropped the Mills and called it Moscow." But what had prompted the late Mr. Shaw to call the settlement after the ancient Slav center is unknown to Mr. Malcolm.

Still less can be gleaned about another Moscow near the Atlantic seaboard—that in Vermont. All we know is that Rudyard Kipling used to live in Vermont with his Yankee wife at one period of his writing career, and that he "always got a great kick out of proper names" in that neighborhood, among others out of Moscow, Vermont.⁸

Then there is Pennsylvania's Moscow, a town of some 900 people eleven miles from Scranton, "an attractive crossroads village founded in 1830 by the Reverend Peter Rupert, a Lutheran minister," with lumbering, production of railroad ties, and the making of maple syrup as its main industries today.⁹ Pastor Rupert might have been of Russian-German origin, and so thought up the town's name, but again it is only a guess on my part. Unfortunately, no letter has come to me from his town in response to my inquiries.

Finally and most fully we have before us the unique history of Moscow in Michigan. A town of 300 in the valley of the Kalamazoo River, it used to be known as "the Moscow ford" on the long journey by stagecoach between Chicago and Detroit. "A rough log tavern erected at the ford in 1831 was replaced 20 years later by the square, two-story clapboard Moscow Tavern, which has remained virtually unchanged."¹⁰ The old tavern is an antique shop now, and I am indebted to its proprietor, Mr. Winn Richards, for two interesting letters he wrote to me last autumn on the origin of the name Moscow, Michigan. According to him—and a booklet he sent me—the origin is mixed Indian-Russian! And this is the story:

⁸Charles Edward Crane, *Let Me Show You Vermont*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1937, pp. 252-53.

⁹*Pennsylvania, a Guide to the Keystone State*, American Guide Series, New York, Oxford University Press, 1940, p. 486.

¹⁰*Michigan, a Guide to the Wolverine State*, American Guide Series, New York, Oxford University Press, 1941, p. 393.

Moscow, in the foothills of the Irish Hills, about 5 miles west of Bundy Hill is reminiscent of the Indians and their attempt at speaking the white man's language. It seems that a few redskins were very hungry having been without food for many days. Ah! across the acres they spy a cow moose. But not being English by birth they say "Uh! Moose-cow dere." It goes without saying that their arrows brought down this cessation to their long famine. Later the name [Moose-cow] became changed to Moscow, during the wars of Napoleon.¹¹

Mr. Richards, in the first of his letters to me, places the episode of the Indian hunt "in the late 1700s." The name Moscow was given the town "due to this incident and the fact that Russia was one of the discussed topics of the day" in the early nineteenth century. "I like the Russians," he continues, "the sparkle of their eyes; I like to see their whiskers rustle when they sing." He concludes with the invitation: "Should you ever get this way, push the bell-button, and the door will fly open." (No whiskers adorn my face, and I sing only under my morning shower, but I do intend to accept the invitation of my new friend in Moscow, Michigan.)

This makes a total of eight Moscovs in the United States, quite a record, in sooth. Yet the list is exceeded by Odessa. In this respect I can do nothing better than cite in full the letter received by me from Mr. Youree D. Adair, postmaster of Odessa, Missouri.

There are nine Odessas in the United States and one Odessadale (in Georgia), and I believe you will find most of them were named for Odessa, Russia. The local high school sent out a questionnaire several years ago to all the Odessas, and those that answered all claimed Odessa, Russia, as their namesake. I have been through Odessa in Texas, also in Nebraska, and in Delaware as well. The Texas town of Odessa is a flourishing city, new rich with oil. There has been no exchange of greetings between us and Odessa in Russia, but in a few more weeks the German yoke will be lifted out there, and I'll see that greetings are exchanged.

As to the origin of his own Odessa in Missouri, Mr. Adair tells me the following:

When the Chicago & Alton Railroad built a track through this section in 1878-79, it went between two small settlements, Greenton to the north and Mt. Hope to the south. When the right-of-way was finally picked, both little settlements started packing their blacksmith shops and general stores and moved to the railroad. When the president of the new railroad, Mr. Blackburn, came to the junction of the two settlements he asked what name the town had. Both settlements wanted their particular name and left it to the president to settle. Being a wise man, he picked neither and remarked that the extensive wheat fields reminded him of Odessa, Russia, where he had lately traveled. The railroad so designated the new town, and

¹¹Mabel Sylvester, *Scenic Irish Hills*, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1938, p. 28.

this was also used by the post-office department which eliminated the Greenton and Mt. Hope post-offices.

Mr. Adair closes his letter: "There were no Russians here then, nor none since, most of the people being from Kentucky and Virginia stock that had come up the Missouri River as far as Lexington and located in this vicinity." But does Mr. Adair realize that his own first name—Youree—is very much like the way the Russians pronounce their equivalent of George?

Railroad presidents of oldtime America seem to have been quite fond of Russian names. From Odessa, Washington, I have this message signed by H. F. Ottestad, the local postmaster:

In response to your letter regarding the foreign name of this Town, I have made inquiries of some of the residents of this Town who have lived here even before there was a town here. They all claim the Great Northern Railway and the Land Agent of the Northern Pacific Railway were responsible for the naming of this Town. Seems as though it was an advertising Idea to get settlers for this part of the country, known as the Big Bend which lies east and south of the Columbia River.

That the "advertising idea" worked may be seen from this further detail supplied by Mr. Ottestad: "Seventy or eighty per cent of the people here are either immigrants from south Russia, or their descendants, and about ten per cent from Bohemia." He is borne out by the authors of the latest official guide which states that Odessa, Washington, dates back to 1886 when it was first settled by German immigrants from southern Russia. The guide relates: "The Great Northern Railroad officials selected the name of the Black Sea port as suitable for a place in the highly productive wheat country." Although a town of a little more than 800 inhabitants, Odessa on the Pacific seaboard is now famous for its several large grain elevators, flour and feed mills, and other facilities which allow the shipment of some 2,000,000 bushels of wheat annually. It is also the trading and social center of a stock-raising area. The south Russian origin of the local people is seen by some observers in the townsfolk's physical characteristics, and their German ancestry is apparent in their speech, to wit: "The inhabitants of the town have markedly swarthy skins and dark eyes, and German is a secondary language."¹²

Across the continent, on the Atlantic seaboard, another Odessa was so named for a similar reason—its wheat. This Odessa is in

¹²*Washington, a Guide to the Evergreen State*, American Guide Series, Portland, Oregon, Binford and Mort, 1941, pp. 327-28.

Delaware, with a present population of only 300 but, in the past, boasting a fine record of grain trade. Last November, Miss May C. Enos of that town informed me as follows:

The town of Odessa, originally named Appoquinime, later Cantwell's Bridge, is situated on the Appoquinimink River, on the old King's Highway, halfway between the city of Wilmington and the capital of the state, Dover. It is the center of a rich farming community, and in years gone by the principal crop was wheat. The Appoquinimink is the largest and most navigable river in the state and thus the town became the shipping center for grain. Six large granaries were built, and wheat was hauled for miles around to be shipped, on a fleet of sailing vessels, to the ports of Philadelphia, Boston, and the East. From 1820 to 1840 there was shipped from this town 400,000 bushels of wheat annually. In 1855, by vote of the people, in town meeting, the name was changed from Cantwell's Bridge to Odessa—after Odessa, Russia, a large grain port on the Black Sea.

The date of the vote is significant—this was the time of the Crimean War, and Russia's fortunes on the Black Sea were very much in the newspaper headlines of the world, America included. But while history was being made at Sevastopol and Odessa in Russia, Odessa in Delaware had its own events of significance, as revealed by Miss Enos: "In 1783 the Quakers built a brick meeting house, which during the Civil War was a station on the underground railway for runaway slaves. The slaves were considered safe after reaching Odessa." A recent guidebook on Delaware devotes several pages to these and other details of its Odessa's past. Among sundry points, the authors make the interesting assertion that the change from Cantwell's Bridge to its Russian name was inspired not by the town's prosperity but contrariwise by "the collapse of the grain trade." They explain the collapse by the shortsightedness of the vessel-owners (of the Delaware port) who fought railroad magnates wanting to bring the iron horse to this shipping center. Seeing a competitor in the locomotive, the ship-owners of Cantwell's Bridge vetoed the railroad's coming to their town. Thus by 1855 "even the hurried changing of the town's name that year to Odessa, for the Russian grain port on the Black Sea, could not prevent the gradual disappearance of the sloops and schooners from the wharves at the foot of the hill."¹³

Wheat seems to have played no part in the naming of a second Odessa on the Atlantic seaboard, that in Schuylers county of the state of New York. From Mrs. Robert Cleaver, a great-granddaughter of

¹³*Delaware, a Guide to the First State, American Guide Series*, New York, the Viking Press, 1938, p. 341.

Phineas Catlin who founded Odessa in New York, I have this note:

In 1824, Phineas Catlin Jr., son of Judge Phineas Catlin, born on the homestead near Millport, N. Y., in 1795, purchased 200 acres of land, where the present village of Odessa is located. Sometime between 1824 and 1827, the town was surveyed and laid out with the aid of John Foster, a surveyor. It was known for many years as "Catlin's Mills" from the fact that Phineas Catlin had bought both the grist and saw mills that were already built, located near each other on this property. *The History of Seven Counties* published by the *Elmira Gazette* in 1883 or 1885, says: "Not long after 1827, by the suggestion of Foster and adopted by the proprietor of the plot, the name was changed to Odessa." We have been unable to account for the name. . . There may have been something of worldwide interest at the time our Odessa was named, I cannot say, I have never looked that up, but I thought perhaps that might have drawn the attention of John Foster to the name, and he may have remembered some geography of that early date.

"Oh Dessa" was the spelling of the name on one letter reaching that town in New York way back in the 1870s, and Mrs. Cleaver relays this to me with gentle amusement. She also writes: "I have been to Odessa, Florida. That is just a crossroad." The postmaster of Odessa, Florida (without signing his or her name legibly enough for me to decipher it) advised me last November: "Odessa, Florida, population: approximately 650. I have been informed that a man of Russian origin named Odessa and St. Petersburg." So once more do we come across the energetic footsteps of Peter Dementyev-Demens-Tverskoy!

To have been called after a girl, who in her turn had been named after Russia's seaport, was the picturesque lot of Odessa, West Virginia. The local postmistress, Miss Naomi King, sends me this message dated November 3, 1943:

This post-office was named by Joel R. King, my uncle, who was a soldier in the Spanish-American War. He named it Odessa, for that was his girl-friend's name. He had met her while in service, and when he came home he submitted her name to the Post Office Department, and it was chosen.

No response greeted my letters of inquiry sent to the largest Odessa in the United States—the Texas oil-town of more than 2,400 inhabitants. In vain do we look for an explanation of its name in the pages of the latest guide. All we read is: "Founded in 1881, it grew up sedately, its settlement by Methodists preventing the opening of any saloons until 1898. Today an oil town, it has a number of night clubs in operation." Odessa's planted elms are a striking contrast to the barren, treeless plains of Texas which surround the town.

In American folklore the Texas Odessa is far-famed for a mystery

mine owned by one of the town's early settlers. He was Old Ben Sublett who, each time he felt like giving his burro a bit of exercise, used to come back to his Odessa home with a load of gold from a shaft hidden somewhere in the Guadalupe Mountains. Townsfolk and people from afar tried to follow Old Ben to his bonanza, but calmly and skillfully he would shake off their greedy pursuit. When offered \$10,000 for a partnership in the mine, he laughed: "Why, I could go out and dig up that much in less than a week's time." Before dying, he told his son Ross to find the mine for himself: "You'll just have to go out and hunt it down like I did." Such was the legendary oldster of Odessa, Texas.¹⁴

At least two American Odessas were started by Russian immigrants, but neither one of them was destined to grow. In fact, the first one—that in Oregon—is no longer in existence. It was established as an agricultural commune in 1883 near Portland, under the name of Novaya Odessa or New Odessa. William Frey (Vladimir Geins), a Russian idealist of much contemporary renown, settled the colony with a score or two of his followers, but hard times and ideological differences caused its demise by 1888, after five brief years of life.¹⁵ The second Odessa, in North Dakota, born in the wave of Ukrainian peasant migration, is now a North Pacific railroad station of minor importance. My letter of inquiry as to its present-day size was returned to me with the official stamp reading: "No such P.O. in State named."

Kiev has a larger namesake in that state, even though it is mis-pelled "Kief." In 1918 the town had a population of some 300 Ukrainians and their progeny, but in November 1943 the local postmaster, Mr. J. Palmer Kvam, informed me: "Our town has a population of 170, and most of the people are Ukrainians. The others are Germans that came from the Ukraine in Russia, excepting myself. I was born and raised in the state of North Dakota, and my parents are from Norway." Mr. Kvam then proceeds to tell this colorful tale of Kief's baptism:

Before the railroad was built through this territory, there was a country post-office here named Owens. Then, later on, after the railroad was built and it was decided to establish a town here, the railroad company asked the residents of the then-growing town to name it—to choose a name with no more than five letters in it. This was in the year of 1908. A special meeting was called by some of the

¹⁴J. Frank Dobie, *Coronado's Children. Tales of Lost Mines and Buried Treasures of the Southwest*, Dallas, Texas, the Southwest Press, 1930, Chapter XIV.

¹⁵Vilchur, *op. cit.*, pp. 35-37.

leading businessmen, inviting the farmers living in the local territory to attend. Several names were considered at the time, some wanting the name of the village or the town from where they came in Russia, others the county in which they lived in the old country, others the family name. Finally it was agreed to choose a name for the town that would apply to all the people here, and the name Kief was decided upon, since all the people here, at that time were from the province of Kief in Ukraine, Russia, and therefore that name would be a remembrance to them and their children for time to come.

Indeed, most of the original farmers in the area were from Tarscha County and the adjacent areas in the Kiev province.¹⁶ For a real concentration of Ukrainians, however, one must look toward the prairies of western Canada.

As regards a similar concentration of Russian settlers and their native place-names in this country, we would look to California—only to be disappointed. For the *molokane* ("Milk People") and *subbotniki* ("Sabbath people"), the Russian sectarians who moved to this country at the dawn of the present century, though they can be found in compact communities in California, are in large cities mainly—in Los Angeles and San Francisco. This explains their failure to give typical Russian names to separate settlements. In those big cities of California the "Milk People" and the "Sabbath People" moved into neighborhoods which already had old-established names.

A list of settlements of California at my disposal mentioned a Santa Fe Railroad station named Siberia, but my letter to that place came back marked, "No Such Post Office in State Named." (My message to Siberia, Indiana, a hamlet of twenty-one residents, was not returned, but neither was it answered.)

I had better luck with Sebastopol, California. The Sebastopol Chamber of Commerce advised me that the town is officially known as the "gateway to Russian River," so called because this river flows into the ocean near the historic Fort Ross established by the Russians of Tsar Alexander I in 1811. Sebastopol is thirty-eight miles from Fort Ross; both are in Sonoma County, and last July 4 it was through Sebastopol that Russian and other pilgrims passed to hear the traditional annual service celebrated in the oldest Russian Orthodox church in the United States—that of Fort Ross. The secretary of the Sebastopol Chamber of Commerce wrote to me: "We have people of all nationalities around Sebastopol. We do have a few inhabitants of Russian extraction." Sebastopol is also famous for the workshop of the late Luther Burbank, which can still be seen

¹⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 40-45.

here. The vineyard and orchards of the town are of great renown. And quite lately the movie-makers of Hollywood have discovered Sebastopol's old homes as background for their "shooting." Of all this the town of Sebastopol is proud, as it is delighted to call the world's attention to its proximity to Fort Ross, where, to quote from the letter of the Chamber's secretary, "the Russian flag floated in 1811." Yet the secretary protests: "Many people are under the impression that it was named after the city of Sebastopol in Russia, which is not true." California's most recent and official guide disagrees with him, nevertheless. It tells the riproaring story of a fight between two pioneers in 1855, where one man locked himself up in a store and the other besieged him. "Onlookers dubbed the store Hibbs' Sebastopol, in reference to the Crimean War siege then taking place. The town helped itself to the name."¹⁷

Other events of Russian history have found their reflection in American town-names through the names of Russia's personages rather than those of her cities. In this category we have Mazeppa in Minnesota and Gallitzin in Pennsylvania.

How did the Ukraine's luckless Hetman Mazeppa, the chieftain who tried to bring his people to the side of Sweden's Charles XII against Russia's Peter the Great, become immortalized in Minnesota? The reply from Mrs. Hazel M. Stull, postmistress of the Minnesota town, was brief and to the point: "Mazeppa was founded in 1855 by James Ford of New York State and named after Byron's poem of 'Mazeppa.' There are no inhabitants of Ukrainian or Russian extraction." Note again the year 1855 and the lively interest in Russia it seems to have caused among the Americans of the time!

The story of Gallitzin in Pennsylvania is longer and far more fascinating. This town of 3,600 in the Alleghanies is named after the Russian nobleman, Prince Dmitri Dmitrievich Golitsyn, who was born in 1770, turned Catholic at the age of seventeen, and then came to the United States in 1792 at twenty-two, never to leave this country again. He became a priest—the first Catholic clergyman to be fully ordained in the young republic of the United States. Soon afterward he moved into the backwoods of the Alleghanies to build a mission and administer to the spiritual and physical needs of Irish, German, and other Catholic immigrants in that wilderness. As Father Demetrius Augustine Smith, the ex-nobleman severed

¹⁷*California, a Guide to the Golden State, American Guide Series*, New York, Hastings House, 1939, p. 360.

ties with his Russian family and did nothing to claim his father's estates left to him. With his own early funds and later with the help of contributions, he founded and extended the town of Loretto, named by him in honor of the celebrated shrine in Italy. Loretto, Pennsylvania, is now a town of some 350 people, and holds the grave of the prince-missionary. Nearby is also the town of Gallitzin "its crooked, aimless, shack-lined streets abbreviated by encroaching piles of mine refuse."¹⁸ Guidebooks seldom mention the fact that among its 3,600 inhabitants many are Polish miners. A tunnel, beginning at the eastern end of Gallitzin, and piercing the Atlantic-Mississippi divide at the height of 2,160 feet, is also named after the prince. In addition, near Duncanville, Pennsylvania, there is the Prince Gallitzin Spring.

Father Smith, né Golitsyn, departed this world in 1840 at the age of seventy—the same age at which Peter Dementyev-Demens died in 1919. What parallels and contrasts may be drawn between these two Russian nobles: each came to the United States a pioneer to help himself and his new neighbors to start towns, but with philosophies and aims at first sight so dissimilar and yet, in some deeper respects, so alike!

But what these Russians did to bring to this country a warm regard for their own land was, in a different way, duplicated by Americans themselves when, in the course of decades and throughout the length and breadth of the United States, they honored Russia by calling their towns after Moscow and Odessa, Kiev and Sebastopol.

¹⁸*Pennsylvania, a Guide to the Keystone State*, pp. 391-92. For biographical and bibliographical data on Prince Golitsyn see Ferdinand Kittell's article in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, volume VI, New York, Robert Appleton Company, 1909, pp. 367-69; and Richard J. Purcell's article in *Dictionary of American Biography*, volume VII, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931, pp. 113-15.

Tolstoy's Childhood*

BY ERNEST J. SIMMONS

AT the age of fifty, Tolstoy wrote in an autobiographical fragment: "I am entirely swaddled; I wish to free my hands but I cannot, and I scream and I weep, and my screaming is disagreeable to me, yet I cannot cease. Someone—I do not remember who—bends over me. And all this takes place in semi-darkness. I remember two people there. My screaming effects them; they are agitated by it, but they do not release me as I wish, and I scream still louder. It seems to them that this is necessary (i.e., that I should be entirely swaddled), but I know that it is unnecessary, and I wish to show it to them, and I again burst out crying, which I dislike but cannot help. I feel the injustice and cruelty, not of people, because they pity me, but of fate, and I pity myself. I do not know, and shall never learn, what this was all about: whether they bound me when I was at the breast and I struggled to free my hands, or whether they bound me when I was over a year old to prevent me from scratching a sore; or whether I have collected many impressions into this one recollection, as sometimes happens in a dream. But the one sure thing is that this was my first and my most powerful impression of life. And what remains in my memory is not my crying or my suffering, but the complexity and contradictoriness of the impression. I wish for freedom; it makes no difference to anyone, but I who need strength am weak, and they are strong."

This first impression on the dawning consciousness of Tolstoy suggests the moral struggle of his whole life. Reflected in the dream-like experience of babyhood are the complex and contradictory relations of man to society that challenged the intellectual powers of Tolstoy's maturity. Then it was the injustice and cruelty of people and not of fate that tore at his heart and conscience and inspired his pen. The infant's scream for freedom was poignantly echoed in the old man's persistent but vain longing to free himself utterly from worldly cares so that he might make his peace with God. It was a

*The present article is part of a new biography of Tolstoy, now in the course of preparation. The publishers, Oxford University Press, have kindly given their permission for advance publication of these chapters [Ed.].

freedom that he found only in death.

From the deep well of memory Tolstoy brought to the surface a few more recollections of his purely infant existence. He recalls a not unpleasant smell, probably from the bran with which his nurse rubbed him in the bath. His sensations on this occasion return to him sharply across the years—the sudden awareness of his own tiny body with its visible ribs, the smooth dark wooden tub, the bare arms of his nurse, and the noise of the warm, steaming, swirling water and the smooth feel of the wet rim of the tub, as he passed his little hands along it. Then there is the recollection of the family bogey named "Eremeevna" that filled him and his sister with mingled fear and pleasure when whispered in a gruff, mysterious voice; and he remembers his agitation and tears over the depraved manner in which the family tutor kicked up his legs when they all danced in a circle.

From a five-year-old boy to a man of fifty is but a slight step, Tolstoy conjectured; yet the sequence of events over this period crowds the memory in an ascending scale. From the new-born babe to a five-year-old boy, however, an immense distance is traversed in physical and mental development, but the chain of memory is hopelessly broken. It was this shadowy region between the unconscious and conscious that principally occupied his thoughts in these few autobiographical notes that he jotted down in 1878. The meagre catch in the net of memory only served to stimulate his speculation over the enormous chasm between the embryo and the new-born babe and the utter incomprehensibility between non-existence and an embryo. Autobiography was quickly sacrificed to the ineluctable difference between being and non-being. The chain of personal memories was not taken up again until twenty-five years later (1903), and then only at the request of his official biographer, P. I. Biryukov. The *Recollections*, unfortunately, are very brief, covering sketchily only the first few years of childhood, and in them he is now primarily interested in the influence on his formative years of those people who were near and dear to him.

II

Genius has no ancestors or descendants; it is an accident of nature and hence inexplicable in terms of human influences. The man who possesses genius is subject to all the ordinary factors and circumstances that influence the average person. Tolstoy's heightened sensibilities made him even more susceptible to such influences, and

among them his mother must be accorded a significant place. Although she died before he was two years old, her moral and spiritual influence persisted to an extraordinary degree throughout his long life. The absence of any real memory of her only served to contribute to the idealized memory that his vivid imagination invoked. This experience is not an uncommon one, and Tolstoy used it in his fiction. In *War and Peace*, it may be recalled, Prince Andrew had died when his son was but a child. Little Nicholas, who had no remembrance of his father in real life, learned about him only from the accounts of his aunts and servants. The shining, heroic image of his father that he imagined was all his own, and it dominated his dreams and childish aspirations. Similarly Tolstoy heard about his mother from aunts and old family servants. Some of her extant letters and her diary provided additional information, but he was rather glad that no portrait of her existed (only a silhouette has been preserved), for it left his own beautiful image of her uncontaminated by reality.

Feminine sympathy, help, and love were essential to Tolstoy, and he sought them all his life. Everything he learned of his mother seemed to contribute to his imaginative conception of her as the very quintessence of feminine solicitude and, no doubt, intensified her spiritual influence over him. Three sons were born before him—Nicholas (21 June, 1823), Sergei (17 February, 1826), and Dmitri (23 April, 1827). Nicholas who possessed unusual qualities, both as a child and as a man, was her favorite, and she lavished on him all the abundant affection of her loving nature. When Leo came along on 28 August, 1828, he displaced Nicholas, who was now old enough to be given over to the care of the family tutor, as his mother's favorite. She had to love someone, and the one love replaced the other. Her latest born she called "*mon petit Benjamin*."

The early education of the children was undertaken by their mother, and her methods are pretty faithfully indicated in *War and Peace* in the description of the manner in which Princess Mary teaches her children. In the matter of moral direction both derive hints from Rousseau's *Emile*. At the end of the day they grade the children's progress or lack of it on "tickets" that are presented to the pupils, and both keep diaries in which they record reactions to the lessons and behavior of their charges. The diary of Tolstoy's mother that has survived contains an interesting account of her efforts with Nicholas. "That diary," Tolstoy remarks, "portrays her passionate wish to do everything to educate Koko [Nicholas] in the best possible way and at the same time how very obscure a perception she had of what such an education should be. She reproves him, for

instance, for being too sensitive, and crying over the suffering of animals when he witnessed them. A man, in her view, had to be firm. Another defect she tried to correct in him was that he was absent-minded and said '*Je vous remercie*' to grandmamma instead of saying '*Bonsoir*' or '*Bonjour*.' In general, she tried to encourage in her son manly and patriotic virtues, but moral and spiritual instruction took precedence over the practical. A kind heart pleased her more than a quick mind."

"I think that my mother was not in love with my father," Tolstoy wrote, "but loved him as a husband and chiefly as the father of her children." No more could be expected from this *marriage de convenance*. Perhaps Princess Mary in *War and Peace*, for whom marriage was a divine institution to which we must conform, exactly echoed the sentiments of her model when she said: "However painful it may be, should the Almighty ever lay the duties of wife and mother upon me I shall try to perform them as faithfully as I can, without disquieting myself by examining my feelings towards him and whom He may give me for husband." Tolstoy's father, morally and spiritually inferior to his wife, could not understand her radiant nature, yet he proved an excellent husband in everything that made for happiness and prosperity in the household.

Tolstoy's mother died on 7 August, 1830, some five months after the birth of her only daughter, Marya, and after barely nine years of married life. It was the first of a series of misfortunes that overtook the growing family in quick succession. The moving description of the death of the hero's mother in *Childhood* was unquestionably suggested by the accounts Tolstoy had heard of his own mother's death. The boundless love of a soul always striving towards the infinite, the eternal, and hence never at peace is the dominating trait that runs throughout the whole characterization in *Childhood*; it is the prevailing trait in the personality of Princess Mary in *War and Peace*; and Tolstoy believed boundless love to be the chief attribute of his mother's nature. In later life he rarely spoke of her to his own children, but when he did it was always with such tenderness and reverence that they thought of her as a saint. "She appeared to me," he wrote in *Recollections*, "a creature so elevated, pure, and spiritual, that often in the middle period of my life, when I was struggling with overwhelming temptations, I prayed to her spirit, begging her to aid me, and those prayers always helped a great deal." She became a "cult" with him, he remarked, and he could not talk about her without tears. At the age of eighty, he wrote in his *Diary*: "This morning I have been strolling in the

garden, and as always I thought of mother, of 'mummy,' whom I do not at all remember, but who has remained for me a holy ideal." Only two years before this there is another entry, even more surprising in the strength of the sentiment. "A stupid, sorry state of mind the whole day," he writes. "Towards evening this state changed into one of tenderness—a desire for affection, love. Like a child, I wanted to cuddle up to a beloved one, a desired being, and tenderly to weep and to be comforted. . . It is done by a child to its mother, as I represent her to myself. Yes, yes, mother, whom I never called, not yet being able to speak. Yes, she is my highest notion of pure love,—not cold, divine, but earthy, warm, maternal. My better, wearied spirit went out to her. Thou, mother, thou wilt caress me. This is all mad, but it is true."

III

Tolstoy was only nine years old when his father died, yet his personality and even his handsome appearance in a frock coat and narrow trousers made an ineffaceable impression on him. He did not love him as he did his mother, perhaps for the simple reason that the mystery that nourished her moral and spiritual influence was lacking. When he was old enough to be conscious of his surroundings, however, his father occupied first place in his esteem, not because of any particular influence over him, but because of his feeling for him.

The father, Nicholas Tolstoy, was the original for the characterization of Nicholas Rostov in *War and Peace*. The external events of Rostov's life and his qualities of mind and personality recall Tolstoy's account of his father in his autobiographical notes. After his marriage the father settled down at Yasnaya Polyana and managed his agricultural affairs with competence, just as young Rostov does at Bald Hills after he marries Princess Mary. And some of the details of his existence as a country gentleman, such as his zeal for hunting, reappear in the novel. Unlike Rostov, Nicholas Tolstoy erred perhaps in being too lenient with his serfs. His son remembers with pride that with one exception he never heard of corporal punishment on the estate when he was a child.

Apart from a few close hunting companions, Nicholas Tolstoy avoided the company of his neighbors. Nor did he allow himself to be drawn into the political activities of the local district. Like so many of the gentry who had taken part in the patriotic campaigns of 1812 to 1815, he was disillusioned by the later illiberal attitude of Alexander I and deeply disappointed by the reactionary rule of

his successor. The result was an aloofness from all government service and an implied if not uttered condemnation of both the foreign and domestic policy of his country. Of course, his son at that time did not understand the significance of this attitude, but he did fully realize that his father never humbled himself before anyone and never changed his debonair, gay, and often ironical tone. And this sense of personal dignity increased the boy's admiration. The son was to possess this same consciousness of his own worth and the same unwillingness to humble himself before anyone, least of all before government officials.

Tolstoy pleasantly recalls the bright, happy demeanor of his father when he was alone with his family. His jests and yarns at meal time kept grandmother, aunts, and children constantly amused. He would draw pictures for the youngsters which they thought the height of perfection. Just before bedtime the children would take their father's study by storm. As he smoked and read they swarmed over the back of his huge leather divan to receive his good-night blessing. Sometimes they found him in the drawing room, where he had gone to lay out grandmother's game of patience. While she placed her cards and took a pinch from her gold snuff-box, one of the aunts would read aloud. "I remember once," Tolstoy writes in his *Recollections*, "in the middle of a game of patience and of reading, my father interrupts my aunt, points to a looking-glass and whispers something. We all look in the same direction. It was the footman Tikhon who (knowing that my father was in the drawing room) was going into the study to take some tobacco from a big leather folding tobacco-pouch. My father sees him in the looking-glass and notices his figure stepping carefully on tiptoe. My aunts laugh. Grandmamma for a long time does not understand, but when she does she too smiles cheerfully. I am enchanted by my father's kindness, and on taking leave of him kiss his white muscular hands with special tenderness."

The happy temperament, fondness for joking and spontaneous fun-making of the father were pronounced traits in the son. Without possessing any special distinction, Nicholas Tolstoy was a solid citizen, a good father, conscious of his own worth, but capable of humility when his pride gained in dignity what he lost by being humble.

IV

Tolstoy's mother had been the center of a household that radiated

possessive feminine love for her five children. After her early death the other women in the family circle drew closer to the motherless youngsters. And they occupy an important place in Tolstoy's childhood memories and are not without significance in his later literary endeavors.

Tolstoy describes his grandmother as a woman of small intellect who had been consistently spoilt by her father and then by both her husband and son. Although Tolstoy suspects that she was jealous of his mother, she deeply loved her son and his children. All sought to please her as the chief person of the household, with the natural result that she grew capricious and often behaved to family and servants with little consideration.

With that arbitrary selectivity of memory functioning over a long stretch of years, Tolstoy's mind fixes on the picture of grandmother in her white cap and dressing jacket, smiling with satisfaction at the children's delight over the large and wonderful bubbles that arose from her old white hands as she washed them with a special kind of soap. Another picture etched in his memory represents grandmother in a yellow cabriolet placed in a clump of hazel bushes, the branches of which footmen bend down so that she can pluck the ripe nuts without leaving her seat. The children fill their own pockets, and grandmother takes them into the cabriolet with her and praises them. Grandmother, the nut-glade, the pungent scent of the leaves, the footmen, the yellow cabriolet, and the hot sun all merge in his mind into one joyful impression of childhood.

Perhaps Tolstoy's most vivid recollection of his grandmother concerns the night he passed in her bedroom with Stepanych, the old blind storyteller, whose remarkable memory enabled him to repeat word for word stories that were read to him. His hearing was so acute that he could indicate exactly the direction a mouse had taken by the sound it made in running across the floor. Tolstoy's sister relates that the sightless Stepanych once interrupted a tale to remark that a mouse had just got into the oil that grandmother used for her icon lamp. He often had his supper in grandmother's room and recited one of his stories while she undressed and went to bed. On one such occasion it was little Leo's turn to spend the night with his grandmother. He remembered her in the dim light of the icon lamp, propped up against the huge pillows, and dressed all in white and covered with white bed-clothes. From the window seat came the tranquil voice of blind Stepanych droning the story of Prince Camaralzaman. Tolstoy could recall nothing of the tale, only the mysterious appearance of his white grandmother, her wavering

shadow on the wall, and old Stepanych with his white unseeing eyes.

The grandmother in *Childhood* and old Countess Rostova in *War and Peace*—especially after the death of her husband—resemble rather closely Tolstoy's grandmother as he describes her in his *Recollections*. The capricious, autocratic mistress of the household is a rôle shared by all three, but in fiction as in real life it never prevented them from manifesting an abiding love for their tyrannized victims.

Aunt Alexandra Ilinishna Osten-Saken, the grandmother's oldest daughter, was the most unusual member of the Tolstoy family circle. Tragedy had wrecked her marriage. They had not lived together very long when her husband, a wealthy Baltic Count, showed signs of mental derangement. In a fit of insanity he shot her, almost fatally. While she was recovering, being pregnant at the time, he succumbed to another mad notion that she would betray him to his enemies, and he tried to cut her tongue out. Attendants rescued her, and Count Osten-Saken was shut up in an asylum. As a consequence of these terrible experiences, she gave birth to a still-born girl, and friends, fearing to tell her of this new catastrophe, substituted the recently born child of a servant. She eventually returned to her parent's house, but after her father's death she and her ward, Pashenka, went to live with her newly married brother at Yasnaya Polyana.

Aunt Alexandra's misfortunes no doubt helped to deepen the Christian faith of a nature already intensely religious. Her favorite occupations were reading *The Lives of Saints* and playing devoted hostess to the numerous monks and nuns and half-crazy religious pilgrims who constantly visited Yasnaya Polyana. Tolstoy's religious mother also had a fondness for these holy people, who were familiar figures on large estates or any place where they could obtain alms. Her favorite among them, and the godmother of her daughter, was Marya Gerasimovna, who for some unknown reason masqueraded as a monk and assumed the name Ivanushka. Aunt Alexandra took her under her own protection after the death of Tolstoy's mother. And as Ivanushka she appears as the female monk and pensioner of Princess Mary in *War and Peace*. In fact, Tolstoy drew heavily upon family accounts and upon his own memory of the dealings of his mother and aunt with these holy people in describing the interesting relations of Princess Mary with "God's folk." Although the remarkable portrait of Grisha in *Childhood* is original, once again Tolstoy was indebted to his remembrance of the religious idiots whom his aunt comforted and aided.

There was nothing insincere in aunt Alexandra's religious zeal. She led a truly Christian life, avoiding luxury, dressing in the simplest fashion, accepting no service she could perform herself, and giving away her money to the needy. She carried her disregard of worldly niceties so far that she neglected to keep clean, and Tolstoy uncharitably recalls the acrid smell that always seemed to enter the room with her. Yet the kindly, happy, self-effacing, unworldly beautiful Christian existence of aunt Alexandra was the vague ideal towards which Tolstoy earnestly but vainly aspired during the last years of his life.

In his old age, when Tolstoy looked back upon the people who had been close to him during his childhood, the one he singled out as having the "greatest influence" on his life was auntie Tatyana Alexandrovna Ergolskaya. She was not a real aunt, and he could never remember the exact relationship—she was his father's second cousin. When she and her sister were left poor orphans, Tolstoy's grandmother, after praying before the icon, drew lots with another relative for possession of the girls. Tatyana fell to her and she brought her up as one of her own children. She turned out to be an unusual child, resolute, resourceful, and devoted to her benefactress. Her courage once challenged by her playmates, she promptly placed a red-hot ruler on her arm, apparently inspired to make this particular kind of test by the dubious example of Mucius Scaevola. It may be recalled that Natasha repeated this incident in *War and Peace* by way of proving her devotion to Sonya. Auntie Tatyana was the model for Sonya, who holds the same position in the Rostov family that her original held in the Tolstoy household. Each was in love with the son of her benefactress, but auntie appears to have given up Nicholas Tolstoy with perhaps more unselfishness than Sonya surrendered Nicholas Rostov; their claims were sacrificed to wealthy brides. Six years after the death of his wife, Tolstoy's father asked his childhood sweetheart to marry him and act as a mother to his children. She rejected the first part of his proposal and gladly accepted the second; for the rest of her life she took the place of a mother to the Tolstoy sons and daughter.

Auntie Tatyana was about forty when she first impressed herself on the mind of the young Tolstoy. He remembered her then with her enormous plait of crisp, black curly hair, jet-black eyes, and vivacious expression. And from the very beginning he loved her. When he was almost five, he recalls, he squeezed in behind her on the divan, and as she caressed him he caught her dusky broad little hand with its energetic cross-vein and began to kiss it and to cry from

tender love of her. Like Sonya in *War and Peace*, she had an extraordinary capacity for self-sacrifice. He never remembered one word of reproach from her, and her whole existence seemed to be devoted to service to others. She loved others not so much for the good they did her as for the good she did them. Love, Tolstoy remarked, was her chief characteristic, and her influence "consisted first of all in teaching me from childhood the spiritual delight of love. She did not teach me that by words, but by her whole being she filled me with love. I saw and felt how she enjoyed loving me and I understood the joy of love. That was the first thing. And the second was that she taught me the charm of an unhurried tranquil life."

V

Such were the people who surrounded Tolstoy in his infancy. The atmosphere properly enough was a feminine one, for he was still confined to the nursery upstairs and to the constant companionship of his younger sister. Dim recollections of being bathed and swaddled and of the secure feeling of boundless love, especially from his auntie Tatyana, are all that he remembers before the age of five. But the world downstairs with his older brothers and their German tutor Fëdor Ivanovich, the great world of men beyond the nursery with his father and the clever coachmen, with horses and dogs and hunting—all this awaited him. And many years later he recalled the change and resurrected all the poignant mixed feelings that attended this solemn event in his young life.

"When I was moved downstairs to Fëdor Ivanovich and the boys," he writes, "for the first time in my life, and therefore more strongly than at any time since, I experienced that feeling which is called a sense of duty, a consciousness of the cross that every man is called upon to bear. I was sorry to leave what I had been accustomed to (accustomed to from the very beginning), and it was sad, poetically sad, to part not so much with people, with my sister, nurse, and auntie, but with my crib and its canopy of pillows, and this new life into which I was entering seemed fearful. I tried to find a happy side to this new life that awaited me; I tried to believe the kind words with which Fëdor Ivanovich lured me to him; I tried not to see the scorn with which the boys received me—the youngest; I tried to think that it was shameful for a big boy to live with girls, and that there was nothing good in the life upstairs with nurse; but at heart I was terribly sad, and I knew that I had irrevocably lost my innocence and happiness, and only a feeling of my own worth and

the consciousness that I was fulfilling my duty sustained me. Many times since I have experienced similar moments at the crossroads of life when entering upon a fresh course. I experienced quiet grief at the irreparability of my loss. I was unable to believe that it would really happen, although I had been told that they would move me downstairs to the boys. But I remember the dressing gown with the cord sewn to its back which they put on me, and it seemed to cut me off forever from upstairs. And I noticed then for the first time not all those with whom I had lived upstairs, but the principal person with whom I lived and whom I had not remembered previously. This was auntie Tatyana Alexandrovna. I recall her—short, stout, black-haired, kind, tender, and compassionate. She put the dressing gown on me, and, embracing and kissing me, she tied it around me; and I saw that she felt as I did; that it was sad, terribly sad, but that it had to be. For the first time I felt that life is not a game but a serious matter.”

VI

That life is a “serious matter” may well be a rational conviction for the adult; for the child, it is a transitory impression inspired by changes that reality thrusts into his little world of make-believe. All the burden and the mystery that troubled the thoughts of five-year-old Lëvchka quickly vanished when he found his new life downstairs a glorious game indeed.

The happy irrecoverable days of childhood stretch out before him like some illimitable terrain, mysteriously beckoning him to explore its sunny valleys and cool forests. After each day's wanderings he returns home, pleasantly weary and very hungry. The cup of milk and sugar finished, he curls up cosily in an easy chair, and healthy childish sleep weighs down his eyelids. He feels the gentle fingers of Auntie Tatyana running through his hair and hears her soft familiar voice, as though far away, tenderly urging him to bed. Her kiss on his forehead rouses him and his lips search for her hand. Soon he is tucked under the quilt, and he presses to him in a corner of the soft down pillow a favorite china toy—a hare or a dog—and hopes the morrow will be fine for an outing. Then he smilingly falls asleep, whispering a prayer to God to make everybody happy. Many years later he recalled these moments and sadly wrote: “Will the freshness, freedom from care, need of love, and strength of faith, that one possesses in childhood, ever return? What time can be better than that in which the two finest virtues—innocent joy and

unbounded need to love—are the only motives of one's life?"

In the nursery Lëvochka had been part of nature, and hence the world of nature—grass, leaves, flowers, trees, birds, and animals—had not existed for him. He discovered them now in the picturesque surroundings of Yasnaya Polyana, and in his impressionable mind a lasting love for God's handiwork was born, a love that is reflected in the many beautiful descriptions of nature and outdoor life in his novels and short stories.

Yasnaya Polyana, where Tolstoy was to spend some seventy of his eighty-two years, was an ideal playground for a boy. Little did he dream then that it would one day become the Mecca of the world. Malaysians, Japanese, Australians, Americans, and representatives from all the nations of Europe would make their way to this little isolated village in the middle of Russia to listen to the wisdom of an ancient white-bearded prophet. Visitors entered the grounds of the estate through a gateway between whitewashed brick towers that look like two strangely-shaped mushrooms topped by Chinese roofs. Grandfather Volkonsky is said to have stationed guards in these towers; on his first visit the humble Chekhov, grandchild of a serf, lost courage when he came in sight of the aristocratic towers and ordered his puzzled driver to turn back.

The way to the house leads through a lane bordered with birch trees, their clean bark gleaming white where the sun strikes it through the leafy shade. In front of the old manor house with its forty-two rooms is a flower garden, and behind extends a large park with ancient lime tree alleys and several small ponds. On the edge of the estate are the thick Zakaz woods that are cut by the Voronka river. From the house, running through a clearing studded with springtime forget-me-nots, is the "bathing-trail" to the family bath-house on the bank of the river. Across the undulating countryside in the distance stretches from east to west a long ribbon of imperial domain known as the Zaseka forest. It bounds on one side the extensive fields beyond the gates of the estate. From the road at harvest time one can see, where a strip of thick high rye has already been cut, a peasant woman reaping with even rhythm or bending over the cradle of her child that has been placed in the shade of the tall grain. In the cleared spaces the bright yellow field is full of sheaves, which black-bearded peasants load on their stubby carts.

But harvest time is also hunting time, and little Lëvochka was soon initiated into the traditions of the chase, sacred among Russian landowners. He remembered the young borzois following his father out into the field and growing excited as the high grass whipped and

tickled their bellys. With their tense tails raised sickle-wise, they leaped gracefully over the stubble behind the horses' feet. Milka, the high-spirited, piebald favorite of his father, ran in front with expectant head raised, waiting for the quarry. The peasants' voices, the tramp of horses and creaking of carts, the merry whistle of quail, the mingled odors of wormwood, straw, and horses' sweat, the dark blue of the distant forest, the light lilac clouds, and the white cobwebs that floated in the air or stretched across the stubble—all these sights, sounds, and smells lingered in his memory when years later he described the first hunting experience of his childhood.

Then there was his recollection of the big gray wolf that the hunters caught alive and brought home in triumph. All stood round in awe as the trussed up beast was unloaded from the cart. They held the wolf down with pitch-forks, and it gnawed savagely at the cords while being untied. At a given signal the beast was released, and in a flash dogs, hunters, and horsemen flew after it downhill and across the fields. Much to the disgust of Lëvockha's father, the wolf escaped, only to appear again many years later in the famous hunting scene in *War and Peace*.

VII

Closer association with his brothers was of first importance in the new existence of the recent graduate from the nursery. They soon initiated Lëvockha into those exciting mysteries that are the peculiar possession of the world of childhood.

Curiously enough, black-eyed Dmitri (Mitenka) left little impression on Lëvockha during this period, although Dmitri was closest to him in age (almost a year and a half older) and played with him more than the other brothers. He was a capricious, difficult child, and Tolstoy remembered only his excessive merriment and the fact that they got along well enough together.

The handsome, proud, yet sincere, Sergei (Serëzha), however, Lëvockha admired to the point of hero worship. He was two and a half years older. Self-conscious and painfully aware of what others thought of him, Lëvockha was impressed by Serëzha's spontaneity of egotism and tried to imitate it. In fact, he imitated nearly everything Serëzha did: his keeping chickens, his colored drawings of them, and the original way he fed his flock in the winter by poking long slivers of bread through the keyhole. The ease and sureness with which Serëzha got things done baffled his brother and at the same time aroused his admiration. Throughout his life Serëzha re-

mained for Tolstoy an inscrutable, mysterious, and endlessly fascinating personality. Their early relations, and particularly the rôle of hero that Serëzha played in them, are accurately suggested in *Childhood*, where he is characterized as Volodya Irtenev.

Nicholas, who was more than five and a half years older than Lëvochka, was naturally the moving spirit among the brothers in all their childhood enterprises. Not only the fact that he was the oldest, but rare qualities of mind and spirit justified his leadership. Lëvochka deeply loved Nicholas, whose influence over him was enduring and important. He believed that Nicholas resembled his mother in his indifference to what others thought about him, in his unusual modesty despite superior mental, moral, and spiritual endowments, and in his firm refusal to judge others. Turgenev used to say of him that he lacked only certain faults to be a great writer. Tolstoy added that he lacked the writer's principal fault of vanity and possessed to a high degree a fine artistic sense, a gay, light fund of humor, an amazing imagination, and a highly moral view of life. He relates how Nicholas would invent folk tales, ghost stories, or shilling-shockers à la Anne Radcliffe for hours together, and so vividly did he realize characters and scenes that one forgot that they were all products of his imagination.

Nicholas' imagination and power of invention, perhaps inspired in this instance by his reading about freemasons and religious sects—he was a wide reader—, created an exciting childhood fantasy that absorbed much of the attention and thought of the Tolstoy brothers for a brief period. (They ranged between the ages of five and eleven at this time.) Nicholas solemnly announced to them one day that he possessed a wonderful secret that could make all men happy. If it became generally known, a kind of Golden Age would exist on earth: there would be no more disease, no human misery, and no anger. All would love one another and become "Ant Brothers." The children adopted the idea with enthusiasm and even organized a game of Ant Brothers. Boxes and chairs were covered with shawls, and they all cuddled together in the dark within the shelter. Tolstoy recalled the feeling of love and tenderness that filled him on such occasions.

Nicholas had disclosed the Ant Brotherhood to them but not the chief secret—the means by which all men would become everlastingly happy. He had written this secret, he said, on a green stick buried by the road at the edge of a ravine in the Zakaz forest. Apart from the green stick, there was also a certain Fanfaronov Hill, and he agreed to lead them up it if they would fulfill all the necessary

conditions. The first was to stand in a corner and not think of a white bear. Tolstoy remembered how he would get off in a corner and vainly try to refrain from thinking of a white bear. The second condition was to walk along a crack in the floor without wavering; and the third was to keep from seeing a hare, alive or dead or cooked, for a whole year. Of course, Nicholas strictly warned his brothers not to reveal these conditions to anyone. If they fulfilled them, and others that he promised to communicate later, then they would have one wish that would come true. And they had to tell Nicholas their wishes beforehand. Serēzha wished to be able to model a horse and a hen out of wax. Mitenka wished to be able to draw everything life-size, like a real artist; and the five-year-old Lēv-ochka, clearly puzzled, lamely wished to be able to draw things in miniature.

The children soon forgot about Fanfaronov Hill and the green stick. Tolstoy, however, traced to the Ant Brotherhood under the shawl-covered chairs his first childhood experience of love, not love of some one person, but love of love. Huddled together under the chairs, the Ant Brothers felt a particular tenderness for each other, and they talked of what was necessary for happiness and how they would love everybody. When he was over seventy, he recalled the incident in his *Recollections*: "The ideal of Ant Brothers clinging lovingly to one another, not only under two armchairs curtained by shawls, but of all the people in the world under the wide dome of heaven, has remained unaltered for me. As I then believed that there was a little green stick whereon was written something which would destroy all evil in men and give them great blessings, so I now believe that such truth exists among people and will be revealed to them and will give them what it promises."

The promise was the brotherhood of man to which Tolstoy dedicated the best efforts of so many years of his life. It is not surprising that he never forgot the little green stick and the yearning for human brotherhood that Nicholas' childish fantasy had evoked. Two years before his death he dictated to his secretary N. N. Gusev, the following: "Although it is trivial, yet I wish to say something that I should like done after my death. Even though it is a trifle of trifles—it is in order that they should not perform any ceremonies in putting my body into the earth. A wooden coffin, and whoever wishes, carry or cart it to Zakaz, opposite the ravine at the place of the 'green stick.' At least, it is my intention to select that and no other place." When he mentioned the green stick, Gusev observed, tears filled his eyes. Tolstoy's wish was carried out.

VIII

If Lëvchka found anything serious in his new life downstairs, it was the irksome hours of study under the guidance of his first tutor, the German Fëdor Ivanovich Rössel. Tolstoy tells us that he faithfully described his tutor as Karl Ivanych Mauer in *Childhood*, and he also appears in the continuation of this work, *Boyhood*. The characterization is unforgettable. Children of the Russian gentry ordinarily learned languages from foreign tutors, although such instructors were often ex-tailors, cooks, or soldiers, who had found their way into Russia and exploited their language as a means of livelihood. Fëdor Ivanovich had been a shoemaker, a soldier, a rope-maker, and a bit of a Don Juan, if the story of his life that he tells so effectively in *Boyhood* is authentic.

As a tutor, certainly, he had little to recommend him, except his unfailing kindness and affection for the Tolstoy children. His intellectual interests appear to have been discouragingly limited to the repeated reading of three works: a German pamphlet on the manuring of cabbage plots, one volume of a *History of the Seven Years' War*, and a treatise on hydrostatics. For good measure he supplemented this learned feast with odd copies of the Russian periodical, *Northern Bee*.

Seated in an easy chair and arrayed in his quilted dressing gown and red tasseled skull-cap, Fëdor Ivanovich heard with an air of pedagogical pomposity endless recitations from a German dialogue book. "*Wo kommen Sie her?*" he would ask in his Saxon accent, and the pat answer would be droned back: "*Ich komme vom Kaffee-hause.*" Failure to know the answer of the exercise book entailed the risk of being sent to kneel in the corner. Sadly Tolstoy recalls that corner of shame in *Childhood*. Vexed with aching back and knees, he picked plaster off the wall and then grew frightened that the noise of a particularly large piece falling to the floor might attract the attention of his absent-minded tutor. But Fëdor Ivanovich heard nothing, for he was once again deep in his treatise on hydrostatics. The kindly, sentimental tutor, however, was no tyrant. Perhaps more important than his German lessons were the virtuous precepts he encouraged of generous tolerance and loving kindness towards all the poor and unfortunate of life, among whom he included himself.

Except for German, in which Lëvchka acquired considerable expertness, little else appears to have been within the teaching competence of good Fëdor Ivanovich. He may have fostered what seems to have been an attempt at a magazine on the part of his young

pupils. In the vast collection of Tolstoy manuscripts in Moscow, two pages of note paper, neatly ruled in childish fashion in pencil, have recently turned up. They are headed, "Children's Amusements," with an indication that the contributions will be written by the four brothers. Beneath this is a sub-heading: "First Part. Natural History. Written by C. L. N. To, 1835," that is, by Count Leo Nikolaevich Tolstoy. Seven brief accounts follow, the first of which is entitled "The Eagle." It reads: "The Eagle is the king of birds. They say about it that a certain boy began to tease it; it grew angry and pecked at him." Similar descriptions follow of the hawk, owl, parrot, peacock, humming bird, and cock. This is the first manuscript of Tolstoy in existence, and it was probably written when he was seven years of age. Nothing else remains of the attempt at a magazine.

Among the gentry, of course, an indispensable subject in the education of any child was French. No doubt Auntie Tatyana, who knew the language better than her own, was the teacher in this instance. She apparently laid a good foundation, for in later years Tolstoy's knowledge of French was quite perfect. He began his study of the language at a very early age, for when he was five he was given the task of teaching little Dunechka Temyashëva her letters in French. Dunechka was the illegitimate daughter of a distant relative of the Tolstoy's, A. A. Temyashëv, a wealthy bachelor. He begged Tolstoy's father, to whom he was devoted, to bring up Dunechka in his household. In return he offered to hand over a very rich property, Pirogovo, if Tolstoy's father would set aside a dowry for the girl. So the quiet, broad-faced child became a member of the family and played with the brothers. Once, Tolstoy recalls, she and Dmitri started a game of spitting a small chain into each other's mouth, but she spat it so hard and he opened his mouth so wide that he swallowed the chain. There was much wailing until the doctor came and calmed all concerned. Indeed, Dunechka gave way to tears as easily as her young teacher, whose propensity in this direction earned him the family nickname of *Lëva Rëva*, "Cry-baby Leo." On one occasion, he remembers, she grew weary with his efforts and stubbornly called incorrectly the French letters that he pointed out to her. The five-year-old pedagogue persisted, and Dunechka burst into tears. So did Cry-baby Leo, and when the mystified grown-ups arrived on the scene, the desperate sobs of both master and pupil prevented them from uttering a word of explanation.

Up to the age of nine Lëvchka's formal education was neither systematic nor thorough. His own inclination, however, and the

example of his elders over this period, unquestionably encouraged that informal but valuable kind of instruction to be obtained from reading good books. There is no actual record of such efforts, except his own story, when he was about eight, of being asked to read Pushkin to his father. He selected from the volume his favorite pieces that he had learned by heart, such as "To the Sea" and "Napoleon:"

The wondrous fate had been fulfilled,

The great man is no more.

"He was evidently struck by the pathos with which I spoke those verses," Tolstoy writes, "and having listened to me, exchanged significant looks with Yazykov [Tolstoy's godfather], who was present. I understood that he saw something good in that reading of mine and I was very happy about it." Not merely the effectiveness of his son's reading, but the choice of poems must have struck the father as unusual. For the poems mentioned, among Pushkin's best shorter pieces, are extremely advanced for an eight-year-old boy, and their selection at least suggests a rare degree of artistic taste and understanding at this age.

IX

In the fragmentary material of Tolstoy's recollections of this period of his life, one can discern the pattern of his nature as a child; the prominent features of the design are also outstanding in the man. An unusually developed sensibility inspired much of his childhood thinking and feeling. It was manifested in his abhorrence of suffering in man or animal; it was the key perhaps to his expansive love for everything and everybody, a love that he strove to deserve for himself as well as to give to others; and it prompted the tears that flowed when he was happy as freely as when sad. When he failed to find happiness in his little world at Yasnaya Polyana, his young mind was wrenched by the perplexity of unanswerable questions.

This disposition of mind is strikingly illustrated in a passage from his *Memoire of a Madman* (1884), in which he clearly draws upon recollections of his early childhood. "I remember once," he writes, "that I went to bed. I was five or six. Nurse Evpraksiya undressed me and sat on the bed.

"Let me, let me," I said, and stepped over the railing.

"Now, then, lie down, lie down, Fedinka. Look, the wise Mitya is already in bed," she said, motioning with her head towards my brother.

"I jumped about in bed, always holding on to her hand. Then I released her, stretched my feet under the blanket, and covered myself. I felt fine. I was quiet and thought: 'I love nurse, nurse loves me and Mitenka, and I love Mitenka and Mitenka loves me and nurse. Nurse loves Taras, and I love Taras and so does Mitenka. And Taras loves me and nurse. Mama loves me and nurse, and nurse loves mama and me and papa, and all love and are fine.' Then suddenly I hear the housekeeper run in and angrily cry out something about sugar, and nurse angrily says that she didn't take it. I become grieved; it is terrible and incomprehensible, and horror, cold horror, seizes me, and I hide my head under the blanket. I recall how once they beat a boy near me, how he screamed, and how terrible was Foka's face when he beat him.

"Will you do it again, will you do it again?" he kept repeating, continuing to beat him. The boy said, "I won't." And then he repeated, "Will you do it again?" and still beat him . . . I began to sob and sob. And for a long time I could not be quieted. . . I remember another time . . . when Auntie told about Christ. She told the story and wished to go away, but we said:

"Tell us some more about Jesus Christ."

"No, I have no time now."

"Stay, tell us," and Mitenka also begged her to tell. And Auntie began again to tell the same thing she had told before. She related that they crucified Him, and tortured Him, and He prayed all the time and did not condemn them.

"Auntie, why did they torture Him?"

"They were evil people."

"Yet, He was good."

"Now enough. It is already nine o'clock. Do you hear?"

"But why did they beat Him? He forgave them, then why did they beat Him? It was terrible. Auntie, was it terrible for Him?"

"Enough, I am going to drink tea."

"But perhaps it was not right for them to beat Him."

"Now, then, enough."

"No, no, do not go."

". . . I wept and wept. . . ."

Suffering and misfortune always puzzled little Lëvockha's mind with the problems of man's inhumanity. When returning from a walk with his tutor, they met a fat steward, Andrei, followed by squinting Kuzma, the coachman's assistant, who was on his way to the stable to be flogged. Lëvockha was horrified, although floggings (rare at Yasnaya Polyana) were the common fate of serfs. And he

was doubly grieved when Auntie Tatyana, who hated corporal punishment, told him—what he did not know then—that he could have prevented the beating. He was equally shocked and bewildered when he heard Temyashëv casually relate how he sent his man-cook to serve as a soldier—a terrible calamity for a serf at that time—, simply because he had taken it into his head to eat meat during a fast. And when the butler, Vasili Trubetskoy, who used to carry him around on his tray, was transferred to another estate, Lëvochka grew fearful over the instability of life and experienced a still deeper sense of love and pity for Vasili. Even his kind tutor aroused his antipathy when he condemned his own dog to be hanged because her leg had been broken. The boys sensed that something was terribly wrong if poor Bertha had to be hanged merely because she was suffering and ill.

The positive side of Lëvochka's sensibility was expressed in spontaneous outpourings of love and in eager attempts to win affection. With the unwavering faith of a child's convictions, he believed that love for people was a natural disposition of the soul, or rather the accepted relationship among all peoples. Its absence, whenever pointedly evident, always troubled him. To the animate and inanimate world he imparted all the happiness of his own warm and loving imagination. On a summer picnic at Grumont, a charming little village about a mile and a half from Yasnaya Polyana, he recalls his joyous feelings evoked by the event: "The coachmen stand in the shade of the trees. The light and shadow speckle their faces, kind, jolly, happy faces. Matrëna, the cowherd, runs up in her shabby dress and says that she has waited long for us, and she is glad that we have arrived. I not only believe, but cannot help believing, that all the world is happy. Auntie is happy while asking Matrëna with concern about her daughters, the dogs are happy . . . , the hens, the roosters, the peasant children are happy, and the calves, the fish in the pond, and the birds in the trees are happy."

On another occasion, Lëvochka's father calls upon him to make up a charade for the company (he was unusually adept at charades). He promptly obliges by combining a letter of the alphabet with those of the word for a bird, which together spell out a "small house." "While I am speaking," he recalls in his *Recollections*, "they look and smile at me, and I know, I feel, that these smiles do not signify that there is something ridiculous in me or in my speech; they signify that while looking at me they love me. I feel this, and there is an ecstatic joy in my soul."

To be sure, Lëvochka was nurtured in an ideal patriarchal world

in which father, grandmother, aunts, and servants surrounded him with loving care and tenderness, a factor of consequence in the development of his own loving and happy nature. "All the people surrounding my childhood," he writes, "from my father to the coachmen, seem to have been exceptionally fine people. Probably my pure, loving feeling, like a bright ray, revealed to me the best qualities of people (such qualities always exist); for me to regard them as exceptionally fine was much nearer the truth than if I had seen only their faults."

Despite his uncommon sensibility, hair-trigger emotions, and a certain shyness, Lëvchka did not shirk the rough-and-tumble world of his three older brothers. "Lëvchka the bubble"—so they called him because of his stoutness as a child—took part in all their games and fought pillow fights with gusto. Indeed, it was his endless high spirits and intense enjoyment of life that seemed to set him apart as a child. He was like a ray of light, his sister Marya said. He would dash into a room with a happy smile, as if he wished to tell everyone about a new discovery he had just made. And she relates that he was fond of jests, always tender, kind, yielding, and never rude. If he were petted, tears of joy would come into his eyes.

The Golden Age of childhood, however, was soon to end. The Ant Brotherhood would be broken up, sorrow and adversity would darken the rose-tinted world of the eight-year-old Lëvchka. Soon life would seem to him like a "serious matter," and the "sense of duty" that oppressed when he was obliged to leave his nursery for the world downstairs would finally become a reality.

O
credi
work
ernm
and
men
W
orde
Indi
wor
we k
tell
ther
plon
not
thes
exce
know
scien
part
som
the
and
pro
T
reig
hea
nor
div

1
zinc

The Soviet Arctic

BY VLADIMIR ZENZINOV

ONE of the indisputable achievements of the Soviet Union is the exploration and development of the Arctic region. Of course, in this case, as in others, one must distinguish between the credit that should go to the government and to the people who worked on the spot. But one thing remains certain: the Soviet government showed much more interest in the possession of the North and much more initiative in exploring it than the imperial government.

When, in December of 1911, the Yakutsk governor, Ivan Kraft, ordered my deportation to the far North,¹ to the lower course of the Indigirka river wither no one had been deported before, his parting words were: "I am glad that an educated man is going to those parts; we know nothing about this distant region, and I hope that you will tell us many interesting things about it on your return." I thought then that the governor chose a rather original method for the exploration of the regions entrusted to him. As a matter of fact, he was not mistaken. Upon my return I did publish several books about these hitherto almost unknown places. This episode was by no means exceptional. Everyone acquainted with the literature on Siberia knows that political exiles have contributed a good deal towards the scientific investigation of this interesting region. The Russian, and particularly the Siberian Arctic, had been attracting attention for some time. The famous chemist D. I. Mendeleyev had pointed out the enormous practical significance for Russia of the exploration and settlement of the North, but not enough attention was paid to his prophetic words.

The history of Russia's Arctic exploration begins in 1648, in the reign of Tsar Aleksey Mikhailovich, when Semen Dezhnev, at the head of a small detachment of twenty-five Cossacks, rounded the north-eastern edge of Russia by sea and thus proved that Russia was divided from America by water, although he himself did not realize

¹I was sent so far as punishment for two attempts to escape from exile. [Mr. Zenzinov was a political exile in Siberia. *Ed.*].

the fact. A very brief account of Dezhnev's expedition was published in 1742 and a somewhat more detailed one in 1758, but no full report was made available until 1851. This explains why, for a long time after Dezhnev's expedition, geographers still continued to consider the existence of a strait between Asia and America as uncertain.

The German philosopher Leibnitz, in his note to Peter I in 1697, insistently advised the Tsar to organize an expedition to North-eastern Siberia which would finally solve the riddle of whether America was connected with Russia. Such an expedition was not equipped until 1724, and was then entrusted by Peter to a Dane in Russian service, Vitus Bering. Peter attached great significance to this expedition and himself prepared for Bering detailed instruction which he signed shortly before his death. The expedition did not reach its destination until 1728. It discovered the strait which had already been found by Dezhnev sixty years before and named it the Bering Straits. They also charted both the Asiatic and the American coasts. From 1733 to 1745 there worked in the Arctic Ocean "The Great Northern Expedition," organized by the Russian Admiralty. It explored and charted for the first time almost the whole of the Northern coast of Russia from the White Sea to Kolyma. The maps of many sections of the Northern Sea Route are still printed on the basis of reports of this expedition. Among its participants were Lt. Khariton Laptev and pilot S. Chelyuskin, and a section of the Ocean and a cape were named after them respectively. In 1741 the Russian government equipped another expedition, again under Bering's command, to explore the Russian coast of America. In the course of this journey Bering died of scurvy and was buried on an island not far from Alaska.

Beginning with 1776, the merchant Gregory Shelekhov built up an active trade on the Aleutians and along the coast of Alaska. He organized systematic commercial expeditions to the islands in the northern part of the Pacific Ocean and to the northwestern coast of America, bringing in fabulous amounts of valuable furs. In 1783 he began to promote the project of a chartered company for the exploitation and management of this region. In 1799, four years after his death, the Russian-American Company was established, and Shelekhov's work was continued by the no less energetic Alexander Baranov who, in the course of twenty-eight years of activity in Russian America, managed to carry the sphere of Russian exploration far to the South, embracing a territory of about one million square miles.

Me
in 179
island
another
vey of
Strait
gel's
the m
Litke
Cape
Bu
geogr
or, as
from
pass
voya
finan
merc
becar
Ca
expe
from
1918
East
sketc
hun
furth
Sovi
Sovi
T
men
ovic
tema
him
tive
In t
take
fam
que
pear
cour
labo

Meanwhile a new expedition was organized by the government in 1790-92, which made charts of all the Aleutian islands and all the islands of the Bering Sea as far north as the Bering Straits. In 1820 another expedition, under the leadership of M. Vasilyev, made a survey of both the American and Asiatic coasts to the north of the Bering Straits up to latitude 69° North. Between 1820 and 1824, F. Wrangel's expedition made a survey of the whole coast of Siberia, from the mouth of the river Kolyma to the Bering Straits. In 1827, F. Litke's expedition charted the coast of Chukotsk peninsula, from Cape Dezhnev to the mouth of the river Anadyr.

But the cherished dream of several generations of explorers and geographers was the opening of the so-called "northeastern passage," or, as it was then called "passage to India," that is to say the route from Europe to the Pacific through the Arctic Ocean. The first to pass this way was the Swedish explorer Nordenskjöld, who made the voyage in 1878-79, going from West to East. The expedition was financed in equal shares by the Swedish government and the Russian merchant Sibiryakov. The voyage lasted two years because the ships became ice-bound and had to winter on the way.

Captain Vilkitsky, the head of the Russian naval hydrographic expedition in 1914-15, was the second to make this voyage, this time from East to West, and he also had to winter on the way. Finally, 1918-19, the Norwegian Amundsen made the voyage from West to East, likewise wintering on the way. Such is the short and very sketchy story of the explorations of the Russian North during the two hundred and seventy years after Dezhnev's daring venture. All the further investigations of the Russian Arctic took place during the Soviet period and to a considerable degree upon the initiative of the Soviet government.

The first initiative, however, came not from the Soviet government but from a group of private individuals (Professors Samoilovich, Kulik, and others) who in 1921 suggested the idea of a systematic exploration of the Russian North to A. Rykov and through him obtained governmental support. The fact of this private initiative is little known and it is not mentioned in official Soviet literature. In this phase of Arctic exploration, a particularly important part was taken by Professor Otto Schmidt who, in 1933-34, became world famous in connection with the "Chelyuskin" expedition. Subsequently all these original Soviet Arctic explorers gradually disappeared. Today Otto Schmidt is off the stage, and one no longer encounters the names of Professors Samoilovich, Kulik, and their collaborators.

When speaking of the Soviet Arctic it is necessary to keep in mind that during the last few years many achievements have been concealed for military reasons, which is, of course, quite understandable and legitimate. As an example, one can cite the complete silence as to the new means of transportation in the eastern and northeastern parts of Siberia. There are some vague hints concerning the construction of new railroad lines (as, for instance, the Baikal-Amur railroad from Baikal to Komsomolsk, and from there to Okhotsk on the Pacific shore). There certainly have been built new automobile roads, among them one to Yakutsk and another to Kolyma. But in Soviet literature it is impossible to find any exact information as to all these new roads. Similar secrecy surrounds the recent development of gold mining in Siberia. There are many reasons to suppose that during the last ten-fifteen years enormous progress has been made in this field, especially in the far North East of Siberia (primarily at Aldan and Kolyma). But again there is no information about gold mining available to the general public.

These instances are not unique. A similar secrecy covers many other Soviet achievements in that remote region. The other reason why it is so difficult to obtain a true picture of the developments in the Soviet Arctic is that the government never makes a sharp distinction between information and propaganda. Moreover, the activities in the Arctic are likely to create particularly strong temptation in this respect. The whole atmosphere of this work is so unusual, so picturesque and exciting, that it undoubtedly stimulates imagination at the expense of respect for facts. But even if one has to make allowances for exaggerations, it still must be admitted that the actual achievements have been very great indeed.

The Soviet press declares proudly that no other country has made so many explorations in the Arctic as the Soviet Union, and this seems to be true. During the last ten-twelve years the Soviet scientific expeditions have been furrowing the Arctic Ocean yearly in different directions. Up to 1917 there were only five stations for meteorological and other observations in the Arctic, at present there are about seventy. All the stations are connected with each other by radio, and every day weather conditions are reported to Bolshaya Zemlya. Polar "winterers" live in the most distant and isolated points of the Arctic region displaying not only unusual self-sacrifice, but real heroism. Sometimes they cannot be relieved for three or four years. The observations of these Arctic stations are extremely important not only for meteorology (the North is the "kitchen of the weather"!), but also for the movements of the ships all over the

Arctic
ment,
Route
be in

The
passag
break
ice of
the o
1933.
it bec
and f
ing y
in or
trans
with
the E
ment
ers v
broke
the A
draw
break
built
had
the A
Engl
"Len
name
been
built
in E
A
the
dism
of th
gani
and

"T
ice n
carrie

Arctic. In the field of Arctic navigation the most important achievement, of course, has been the establishment of the Northern Sea Route, since without it the development of the whole region would be impossible.

The first Soviet expedition, the aim of which was to achieve a passage through the Arctic Ocean, took place in 1932 on the ice-breaker "Sibiryakov." The propeller of the ice-breaker broke in the ice of the Chukotsk Sea and it had to winter in the ice—it reached the open waters of the Pacific Ocean only the following year. In 1933, another ice-breaker, "Chelyuskin," went over the same route; it became ice-bound in the Bering Sea, was carried back by the ice, and finally crushed. The crew was rescued by airplanes. The following year, the ice-breaker "Litke" managed to cover the whole route in one uninterrupted voyage, and since 1935 regular steamship transportation has been established. It connects the Pacific Ocean with European Russia and thus serves the whole Northern coast of the Eurasian continent. It must be mentioned that the Soviet government inherited from pre-revolutionary Russia all the big ice-breakers with the help of which the road through the Arctic ice was broken. The first Russian ice-breaker was "Ermak," built in 1898 at the Armstrong Shipbuilding Works at Newcastle, according to the drawings of Admiral S. O. Makarov. This was the largest ice-breaker in the world (8,000 tons). Even the American ice-breaker, built especially for the Perry expedition to the North Pole in 1909, had only 1,500 tons. However, "Ermak" was not destined to see the Arctic—it was left in the Baltic Sea. In the winter of 1916-17, England built seven ice-breakers for Russia, among them "Krasin," "Lenin," "Malygin," and "Sedov," as they were subsequently renamed by the Soviet government. The ice-breaker "Sibiryakov" had been the Scottish whaler "Bellaventura"; "Chelyuskin," a Danish-built transport vessel; "Litke," the former "Earl Grey," was built in England in 1909.

At the present time all the work in the Arctic is concentrated in the Northern Sea Route Administration, which is headed, since the dismissal of Professor Otto Schmidt, by J. D. Papanin, the leader of the 1937 expedition to the North Pole.² It is a tremendous organization which embraces the whole coast territory of the Arctic and all its waters. It rules over a kind of Arctic Empire, exercising

²The expedition, which had only four members, spent 274 days on the floating ice near the North Pole where it had been landed from airplanes. The currents then carried it to the shores of Greenland.

control over such varied fields as exploring, shipping, airways, trade, industry, fishing, education, medical service.

In an official report made at the end of 1939, Papanin declared that the "Northern Sea Route was a powerful means for the development of the productive forces of the Far North and for the strengthening of the defenses of the Union." Much had already been achieved. In 1939 the new Soviet ice-breaker "Joseph Stalin," for the first time in the history of Northern Sea Route navigation, made a through trip from West to East and from East to West *in one voyage*. In the same year, according to Papanin, almost all vessels utilized *local coal* to the extent of 78.4 per cent of the total consumption. But, as Papanin pointed out, the fundamental goal—"the conversion of the Northern Sea Route into a regular water route which would provide a systematic connection with the Far East" has not yet been achieved. Thousands of tons are transported annually by sea, but still they represent only a small fraction of the cargo which is delivered by the Trans-Siberian Railroad. In addition, there are not enough small vessels on the spot for the delivery of the cargo to the coast. Nevertheless, the key ports of the Arctic coast — Dickson Island, Kozhevnikov Bay, Tiksi Bay, Ambarchik, Providence Bay—have been mechanized to speed up the movements of big cargo boats, and in recent years the development of the water transport has been going on at an incredibly rapid pace. In 1936, in the area of the Indigirka River 50 tons of freight were delivered and in 1939—1,318 tons. During five years 1932-1937 the deliveries in the Kolyma region increased 2,700 per cent. In 1930, the total deliveries of cargo to the coast were 50,000 tons, and in 1938, 240,000 tons. Not only the quantity of the cargo was increased, but the speed of the steamer transportation was increased also. In 1933, a transport broke her way with difficulty up to the mouth of the Lena river and had to winter there, while in 1940, ten transports not only reached Lena, but returned to Murmansk in one voyage. The new transport "Dickson" which made its first voyage in 1940, not only went from Murmansk to Lena and back on that voyage, but managed, during the same navigation season, to sail again from Murmansk as far as Igarka on the Yenisey. Lately, many new ice-breakers have been built, two of them of 11,000 tons each. In 1940, the Soviet Arctic fleet had over forty ice-breakers—more than any other country in the world.

The air routes have been developing in the Arctic simultaneously with the sea routes. In 1932, only 500 flight hours were made in the Arctic; in 1937—16,000. In 1937, there were transported by air

8,800
quan
is of
trans
Arcti
othe
at th
sible
by v
water
to th
ing
help
ever
R
of t
grea
thei
reca
earl
man
Nov
by
plan
app
atel
also
in c
hou
ing
Sov
Dic
at t
l
eac
ent
ski
in
ing
of
ove

8,800 passengers and 1,600 tons of freight, including a considerable quantity of machines for the new industrial centers in the Arctic. It is obvious that aviation has become one of the regular means of transportation in that region. But its importance in the life of the Arctic goes beyond that. It plays a great part in geographical and other exploration: it helps to maintain contact with the "winterers" at the farthest and most isolated observation points; it makes possible the taking of air photographs for maps; it guides the steamers by warning them of ice congestions and pointing the way to open waters. In the White Sea and at Murmansk aviation is of great aid to the fishing industry, watching the migration of the fish and pointing out the location of shoals. During the last few years it has proved helpful also in deer-breeding and hunting, by locating the herds and even to some extent regulating their movements.

Radio has radically changed life in the Arctic, and without it none of the present achievements would have been possible. One of the greatest difficulties the polar explorers had to face in the past was their complete isolation from the rest of the world. It is enough to recall the experiences of Nansen, Amundsen, and Sedov; or, in the earlier period, those of Franklin, De Long, and Baron Toll. How many terrible polar tragedies were connected with this isolation! Nowadays, all the vessels navigating in the Arctic are interconnected by radio, and are in constant communication with their pilot-airplanes. In 1933, after the wreck of "Chelyuskin," the crew could appeal for help directly to Moscow, and the help was sent immediately, so that not only the whole crew was saved by airplanes, but also the dogs. On the floating ice near the North Pole, Papanin was in daily communication with Moscow, and during especially trying hours he and his companions could bolster up their morale by listening to concerts from Moscow, London, and New York. One of the Soviet explorers, Krenkel, tells the story of how, while wintering at Dickson, he listened and talked to Admiral Byrd who was at the time at the South Pole.

In 1942, all the sixty-seven polar stations were connected with each other, and the big centers with Leningrad and Moscow. At present there are five key radio stations—at Anadyr, Tiksi Bay, Chelyuskin Cape, Dickson Island, and Amderma. I myself happened to hear in Paris a broadcast from Igarka via Moscow.

The rôle of the radio in Arctic life can be illustrated by the following account of what today must be a frequent occurrence in that part of the world: "Comrade lecturer Bardadyn has flown by airplane over the far Arctic island Henrietta. Four polar workers have been

living on that island for three years without being relieved. Because of the heavy ice, the ice-breaker could not reach the island and neither could the hydroplane make a landing. Bardadyn had to converse with them over the radio from the plane. While the airplane cruised over the island and the comrade flier Cherevichny threw down the load for the winterers, the lecturer answered their questions—about the German-Soviet Pact, about the basic resolutions of the Eighteenth Conference of the Party, about the life on Bolshaya Zemlya, and many other things. There was a lively conversation. All this took place during the blind flight in the fog covering the island.”³

For reasons mentioned above, the most difficult task is to obtain a sufficiently clear and complete picture of the actual settlement of the Soviet Arctic and of the exploitation of its resources. It seems that particularly striking progress has been made in the Kolyma region. The Kolyma river flows some 1,000-1,200 miles northeast of Yakutsk. Under the old régime, the few and scattered small settlements situated along its course were among the most remote and desolate places used for political exile. To the southwest of Kolyma lies the Okhotsk coastal region, and that too was one of the wildest parts of North-Eastern Siberia. When I was there in the fall of 1906, it had hardly any population at all except a relatively few Tungus nomads.

And this is what I learned about this very region from an account published in 1939. A port has been created on the north coast of the Sea of Okhotsk, in the Bay of Nogaev, where ocean-going vessels lie at anchor. Nearby stands the newly built town of Magadan which possesses an electric power station, motor-repairing, and wood-working factories, technical schools, houses with bathrooms, a park of culture and rest, newspaper and a literary magazine, libraries, a theatre and a museum, which is visited by almost three hundred persons daily. Around Magadan there are state farms where one can see “the cleared fields divided into beds, the glass of greenhouses sparkling in the sun, and chickens running about in the fenced-off taiga.” From Magadan an automobile road runs for hundreds of miles in a northerly direction. “Columns of lorries, tractors with trailers, passenger busses, motorcycles and steamrollers” travel along this road which is provided with repair shops, refreshment stands, and gas stations. The road passes through new towns and villages, and on the way one can see airdromes, meteorological stations, and

³*Sovetskaya Arktika*. January, 1940.

chemi

Th
two f
the K
region
less d
sourc
ands
some
One o
Bay,
has be

Th
basin.
as we
are b
Ever
of po
and t
exper
some
and c

Gr
still
Siber
publi
infini
ing t
wher

Co
day v
only
in th
waiti

“N

“R

“T

chemical laboratories.⁴

The startling rapidity of the change can, perhaps, be ascribed to two factors. First, the discovery of rich gold deposits has turned the Kolyma basin into one of the most important gold-producing regions of the Soviet Union.⁵ The second factor, and probably, a no less decisive one, has been the availability in this region of a new source of manpower. Between 1929 and 1933, hundreds of thousands of the dispossessed "kulaks" were deported here as well as to some other points of the Russian North, both in Europe and in Asia. One of the largest concentration camps is situated near the Nogaev Bay, and there can be no doubt that the labor of these deportees has been largely responsible for the new construction in the region.

The development, however, has not been limited to the Kolyma basin. Gold and many other metals have been discovered elsewhere as well, and, according to the Soviet press, numerous coal deposits are being mined today in various places along the Arctic sea-coast. Everywhere gold-mining and coal-mining has led to the increase of population, to the rise of new towns, the building of new roads, and the establishment of new industries. Simultaneously, interesting experiments have been made in the field of arctic agriculture, and some information is available on the progress of vegetable, livestock, and dairy farming in the new settlements far up in the north.

Great as all these achievements have been, the development is still in its initial stages only. Years ago Fridtjof Nansen called Siberia "the Land of the Future," and in the preface to his book, published during the First World War, he wrote as follows: "The infinite plains of Siberia are still waiting for men. It was so comforting to see with one's own eyes that there is on earth plenty of place where millions of happy homes can be established."⁶

Could not this statement, made thirty years ago, be repeated today with greater strength of conviction? Could it not be applied not only to Siberia but to the Arctic as well? There will be enough work in that vast region for many generations to come. The Arctic is still waiting for men.

⁴Nicholas Mikhailov, *Land of the Soviets*, N. Y., 1939, pp. 206-208.

⁵R. A. Davies and A. J. Steiger, *Soviet Asia*, N. Y., 1942, p. 285.

⁶*Through Siberia, the Land of the Future*, London-New York, 1914.

Pushkin's Ode To The Old School Tie

BY EUGENE RAITCH

*The youth who roamed through these valleys
For a century now is dead,
But still in the wild-grown alleys
We listen to his light tread.
From time to time an acorn
Softly falls from the old oak-tree.
Here lay his gloves and his tricorne,
And a crumpled tome of Parny.*

Anna Akhmatova, "Pushkin."

On January 24, 1944, Stalin announced, in an order of the day, the liberation of the town of Pushkin. This place, fifteen miles south of the capital city of St. Petersburg, originally was the village of Sarskoe. Later, it became known to the world as Tsarskoe Selo, the village of the Tsars, the Russian Versailles. This place is—and will always be—sacred to all lovers of Russian poetry—and this means to the whole of the Russian people, who alone among the peoples of Western civilization have preserved poetry as a living art, equal to music in its appeal to popular imagination. Of the generation which followed the French revolution, Pushkin wrote:

"Dumbfounded witnesses of a tremendous fall,
To balance their accounts is now their only goal.
They have no time for jokes, for love they have no leisure,
And would not argue nights about a poem's measure."

It seems, however, from all accounts that Russians of the post-revolutionary period, like their fathers, have plenty of leisure to argue about versification—despite dialectic materialism and industrialization.

Modern Russian literature has its roots in poetry and has never denied this origin—witness Dostoevsky's homage to Pushkin. It was

*This poem as well as the other verse in this article have been translated by the author. [Ed.].

born in the Great Park of Tsarskoe Selo, sometime about the year 1815, when a curly-headed, dark-skinned youth roamed through its alleys and glades with a volume of frivolous French poems of Grécourt or Parny in his pocket. When, in 1811, at the age of twelve, Pushkin became a student at the Lyceum of Tsarskoe Selo, he had behind him an unhappy childhood in the home of empty-headed, disorderly, and ever-quarreling parents. After he graduated from the Lyceum in 1817, he was never to have more than a few weeks of undisturbed happiness in the remaining twenty years of his life. The six years spent at the Lyceum remained the only serene period of his life.

" wherever I may go
I will arrive, I will depart a stranger,
My fatherland is—Tsarskoe Selo."

If Tsarskoe Selo became the home of Pushkin, he became its *genius loci*. When Russians read despatches describing the destruction of the palaces of Tsarskoe Selo, its priceless furnishings of malachite and amber scattered in mud or carried away by the invader, they think with even more bitterness of the alleys of the Park through which Pushkin often wandered, desecrated by the hobnailed boots of German soldiers; of the trees which have shaded his musings, mutilated by bombs, of the marble benches and pavilions where he composed his first poems, defaced or destroyed.

An easy way to immortality is to have a street or a town named after one. Even more than the provincial lawyers and wine merchants of the Third Republic, Russian revolutionaries have enjoyed presenting each other with these free tickets to fame.

Of course, these passports to posterity usually prove to be fakes. A generation after the new name has been solemnly affixed to the four corners of an intersection, no local inhabitant remembers the man whose name is printed on his stationary. Immortality is not accorded by the vote of a City Council, and the spectre of Oblivion is not exorcised by decree.

Sometimes, however, the names of a town and a man become indivisibly associated, even if they do not sound alike. Thus Weimar belongs to Goethe; thus Geneva is dominated by the spirits of Calvin and Rousseau; thus Leningrad remains—under any name—the city of Peter the Great.

Similarly, the names of Pushkin and Tsarskoe Selo are associated forever. When the one-time despisers of all Russian tradition began their transformation into the legitimate heirs of ancient Russian glories, they admitted the great spirits of Russia into the circle of

those to be honored by geographical immortality. While the big cities—like ancient Tver, the once mighty rival of Moscow—remained reserved for party dignitaries, small railway stations were accorded to Tolstoy and Turgenev. At that time Pushkin, too, received an accolade, and children, to whom the Village of the Tsars was dedicated in 1919, had to yield it again, and "Detskoe Selo" became the town of Pushkin—a gesture as empty as would be the changing of the name Stratford-on-Avon to Shakespearville.

While Tsarskoe Selo had shielded the adolescence of a genius, he has repayed his debt by making all Russians look upon this place through his eyes. Tsarskoe Selo may have been, before 1917, a sleepy little township full of retired bureaucrats and petty palace officials, dominated by a dull and degenerate court; and afterwards a museum, where big-eyed peasants, their feet stuck into enormous felt overshoes for the protection of precious floors, were shuffled from room to room to be instructed in the wickedness of the former inhabitants. It may now be a heap of snow-covered rubble in the midst of a desolate plain; and it may one day be restored as a model garden city of glass-and-concrete, with plenty of modern sanitariums and homes for retired scientists and ex-heroes—but in the imagination of Russians, it will always remain a poetic wilderness, guarded by sylvan nymphs, the childhood home of the Russian Muse.

The prerogative of a genius is to make us see through his eyes and hear with his ears. Many modern writers have sharp eyes and photographic memories; but when they look upon the face of a woman, they see a pimple, and when they think of the hands of a man, they remember the dirt under his nails. What Pushkin saw, in men and things alike, was their inherent beauty and nobleness. He looked upon a rainy autumn day and saw the melancholy charm of an "unloved child" in the family of seasons. He looked at the endless, straight, treeless streets and barrack-like buildings of St. Petersburg and saw the unmatched beauty of this fantastic city, conjured by Peter the Great from the Northern wilderness. A hundred and twenty years later, the defenders of Leningrad would still see their city as he has revealed it to them, would love it with his love, and fulfill his prophecy:

"Oh Peter's City, thou shalt stay
Unshakable in tempests' sway."

Pushkin looked at Madame Kern, a provincial heroine of many rather earthly adventures—and called her "a fleeting vision, a genius of pure delight." He was not a blind youth in love; he understood Madame Kern very well, and, an experienced Don Juan

as he
he w
and
of c
raph
T
brain
in a
crats
tacts
prof
of M
men
occu
que
naiv
thes
tran
eyes

T
pro
ove
are
com
sche
nec
zea
mic
ous
civi

as
of
bro
all
he
lov
Tie

as he was, he made good use of his knowledge; but on the day when he wrote these lines he saw in her what nobody else had recognized, and if we are wise, we will believe his vision rather than the gossip of contemporary memoirists, or the reports of conscientious biographers.

The Lyceum of Tsarskoe Selo might have been a misbegotten brainchild of Tsar Alexander I, who imagined that one can create, in a country of serf owners and serfs, a breed of humanitarian bureaucrats, by isolating a group of adolescents for six years from all contacts with life and placing them in charge of a couple of liberal professors, a couple of ignorant martinets, and an emigré brother of Marat. The thirty boys who were first selected for this experiment might have been but an average group of youngsters, who occupied much of their time, not too severely taxed by the grandiloquent but vague and disorderly curriculum, with games, pranks, and naive attempts at literary production or journalism; but this school, these teachers, these schoolmates, stand magically illuminated and transfigured by the presence of Pushkin in their midst. Through his eyes, we see the eternal truth of the relation of Scholar and Teacher:

"To him the offerings of Heart and Wine;
In our souls the flames of love he lighted,
He laid the cornerstone, the ship he righted,
He brightly made the lamp of Wisdom shine."

The annual reunions of the Lyceum alumni of the class of 1817 probably were not too different from other similar gatherings all over the world: in the first year or two, lively and natural, as are reunions of young men who still have most of their memories in common; later, rapidly becoming more and more forced and dull, as schoolmates drifted apart in life; finally, turning into silly and unnecessary affairs, kept alive by the untiring efforts of one or two zealots, who try desperately to keep together the dwindling group of middle-aged men who have become alien to each other—the pompous Chancellor of the Empire and the radical journalist, the prim civil servant and the habitual drunkard.

But this particular class—the Lyceum class of '17—had Pushkin as one of its members, and he saw, behind the commonplace ritual of the alumni days, the antique ideal of manly friendship, the brotherhood of youth companions which follows the man through all his ages, a friendship, "inviolate, immortal, undivided," in which he is more secure than in all later relationships of his life—service, love, or family. This is why the one perfect "Ode to the Old School Tie" in world literature came to be written in Russia, and dedicated

to the Lyceum of Tsarskoe Selo, and not in English or French, in honor of Eton, Harrow, or Saint-Cyr.

OCTOBER 17, 1825

I.

The woods are bare of gold and scarlet trim.
The early frost the fields with silver covers.
For a short while, the sun in cloudbanks hovers,
And hides again behind the mountain rim.
Dance merrier, sparks; glow brighter, golden embers;
And thou, oh wine, thou friend of autumn rains,
Give to my heart, that all its woes remembers
Thy sweetest gift—forgetfulness of pains.

II

I am alone. The festive day is sad.
No friend is here to join in celebration,
To drown in wine the grief of separation,
To wish him health and happy years ahead.
I drink alone. The fantasy, evoking
The feasts of old, in vain my friends recalls;
At exile's door no friendly hand is knocking,
No steps resound in my deserted halls.

III

I drink alone—while far, on Neva's banks
My friends—I know—today my name are hailing.
But are they all there? Or who else is failing?
Whose place is empty in the thinning ranks?
The covenant, that all our hearts is bonding,
Who did forget? Who did our pledge betray?
When brothers call, whose voice is not responding?
Who did not come? Who is not there today?

IV

He did not come, our singer sweet and free,
Whose melodies our meetings did enliven.
An early death to fiery youth was given,
Under the skies of sunny Italy,
And on his grave, no friendly hand has written
A word of prayer in his native tongue,
To give sad comfort to a Northman, smitten
By loneliness among the Southern throng.

V

And you—are you among your friends and mine,
Of foreign skies you unrepenting lover,
Or does your ship amidst the icebergs hover,
Or sail again across the steaming line?
Bon voyage! You left us lightly, heeding
No voice by Oceans, thunderous and free,
And ever since the stars your steps were leading,
Oh favorite son of the tempestuous sea!

VI

Our secret hopes, our cherishèd beliefs
You have preserved in your peregrinations;
Our loud disputes, our merry celebrations
Still filled your ears amidst the thundering reefs.
You cried our names into the roaring thunder,
You stretched your hands the endless seas above,
You sang our hymn "The fates will tear asunder
The bonds of Friendship, and the ties of Love."

VII

Above all blessings is our Union worth,
By which my soul in steadfastness abided;
Inviolatè, immortal, undivided,
The friendly Muse had blessèd it at birth.
In all the world, in happiness or danger,
On all my paths—wherever I may go—
I will arrive, I will depart a stranger,
My fatherland is—Tsarskoe Selo.

VIII

By blasts of illwind toss'd from shore to shore,
From place to place by hate and envy driven,
I had my trust to new companions given,
With open arms and childish hope of yore.
My heart, rebellious, passionate and tender,
My bleeding heart, in unsuspecting haste
To friends untried I did in faith surrender—
But unrequited trust had bitter taste.

IX

And now—when after banishment and flight
I found this home, wind-swept and winter-frozen,
For unexpected joy three days were chosen,
And three of you, oh friends of heart's delight,
I could embrace. The first, to poet's bower
You, Pushchin, came, my loneliness to ease.
The day of gloom, the endless twilight hour,
Became a time of happy memories.

X

You, Gorchakov, to riches born and fame,
Praise be to you—your fortune's icy glitter
Did not your heart empoison or embitter,
For honor and your friends you are the same.
On entering life, we early separated,
By different roads to distant goals to race;
But when our paths by chance to cross were fated,
We met again in brotherly embrace.

XI

When sudden storms upon my head broke loose,
And like a child, abandoned by its mother,
I hid my head, I longed for you, my brother,
For you, oh Herald of the Virgin Muse.
And you did come, oh son of Inspiration
And noble Laziness, oh Delvig mine,
To lift my soul from depths of desolation,
Rekindle faith in Providence divine.

XII

From early youth our hearts were all alight
With love of song, and full of exaltation;
Two Muses knew our humble habitation,
Their whispers made our nightly vigils bright.
But while, through streets, in search of fame, I wandered,
You sang for Muse and for the chosen few.
A spendthrift fool, my life, my gifts I squandered,
In proud retreat your noble genius grew.

XIII

Art's service true all wantonness abhors,
True beauty is by dignity abiding;
But vanity the steps of youth is guiding,
And wanton dreams are foolish counsellors.
Too long we dream—and suddenly awaken,
Turn back our eyes, no footprints there to see.
Was this the path, Wilhelm, that we have taken,
My brother twin in Art and Destiny?

XIV

'tis time, 'tis time, let's seek refuge and rest,
Where wilderness its fair protection offers,
Far from the world, wherein the Poet suffers,
I wait for you, oh my belated guest.
Come, with the fire of your inspired stories,
My frozen heart to set again aflame.
We'll talk about Caucasian battle glories,
About our loves, and poetry, and fame.

XV

'tis getting late! But you, my friends, feast on,
And share in faith that I today am voicing.
The day will come, the day of our rejoicing,
Before this year its fateful course has run.
Fate will fulfill my secret aspirations,
We'll feast together, brothers, you and I.

How many tears, how many exclamations,
And sparkling cups, uplifted to the sky!

XVI

And the first toast—oh charge the glasses full,
And lift them high, in ardent supplication:
We pray to Thee, oh Muse of Jubilation,
Lyceum shall live, give blessing to our School.
To teachers all, the dead ones and the living,
Who by our youth as faithful guardians stood,
Let's raise our glasses, and all ills forgiving,
With thankful hearts, let's praise for all the good.

XVII

Yes, celebrate as long as we are here,
But think of all who from our midst have vanished.
The ones who died, the others who are banished;
Days go, time flies, our own end may be near.
Invisibly declining and decaying
We near the start where we began our way,
And who, his stay among us overstaying,
Will be the last to celebrate our day?

XVIII

Unlucky friend! Amidst a changing land
Unbidden guest of alien generations,
He will recall the din of celebrations,
And hide his tears behind a trembling hand.
Oh may he then, recalling ancient glories,
Sad solace find in one last glass of wine,
As I today, forgetting woes and worries,
Did celebrate this lonely feast of mine.

This epistle was sent by Pushkin to his friends on the occasion of the Lyceum anniversary of 1825, eight years after their graduation. He had been absent from every reunion since 1820, when he was ordered to leave St. Petersburg as a person considered danger-

ous to
in the
love a
howev
hailov
in this
was hi
at the
Lyceum
burg b
job wh
noblen
very v
stanza
"TH
path.
gates,
the po
I tu
nightst
catches
An ol
almost
The
mous o
a fire i
Push
comed
tation,
talked
tween
secret
them f
kin ha
talkati
"It
little,
horses
three.
the las
Ten
St. Pe

ous to the government. But previous anniversaries had found him in the South, in Bessarabia, or Odessa, preoccupied with romantic love adventures, exciting new friendships, and reckless duels. Now, however, he was utterly alone, banished to his family estate of Mikhailovskoe near Pskov. Of the three schoolmates who visited him in this "storm-bound and winter-frozen" home, one—Pushchin—was his closest friend at the Lyceum. This forthright man had taken at their face value the phrases about civic virtue, heard from the Lyceum professors, and had scandalized the society of St. Petersburg by abandoning a respectable military career and accepting a job which was then considered below the dignity of a self-respecting nobleman—that of a magistrate in criminal court. Pushchin left a very vivid description of the meeting to which Pushkin alludes in stanza IX:

"The horses galoped between snow banks, uphill by a winding path. A sudden turn—and the sleds crashed through half-closed gates, the bells jingling wildly. We could not stop the horses before the porch and got stuck in the deep snow in the middle of the yard.

I turn round to see Pushkin on the porch, barefooted and in his nightshirt. The frost is terrible, but at such moments nobody catches cold. We look at each other, we embrace, we stand silently. An old woman comes running and finds us still embracing—he almost naked, I in a snow-covered greatcoat."

The house was unheated—in January—and when Pushkin's famous old nanny, his only companion at Mikhailovskoe, tried to make a fire in honor of the guest, the friends were almost asphyxiated.

Pushchin brought with him the manuscript of Griboedov's new comedy "Woe from Wit," and Pushkin, who was a master of recitation, read aloud several scenes with great delight. The friends talked about politics, but Pushchin was evasive. It was agreed between Pushkin's friends, most of whom were active members of secret political societies, that the poet should be kept away from them for his own sake as well as for the protection of secrecy. Pushkin had no concept of personal danger and was as impulsive and talkative as a child.

"It was after midnight," so ends Pushchin's story, "we ate a little, a third cork blew up. We embraced. The coachman had the horses harnessed; the bells rang before the porch; the clock struck three. We drank one more glass, but sadly, as if we knew that it was the last time we drank together. . ."

Ten months later, Pushchin stood at the Senate Square in St. Petersburg, one of the leaders of the Decembrist rebellion. He

was sentenced to death by beheading, but his sentence was commuted to twenty years of hard labor in Siberia, followed by deportation for the rest of his life. When he was permitted to return to Russia in 1856, Pushkin had been dead for nineteen years.

Baron Anton Delvig, who visited Pushkin on April 20, 1825, three months after Pushchin—the meeting to which Pushkin refers in stanzas XI and XII—also was a close friend of the poet. Five students of the first graduating class of the Lyceum were Baltic noblemen. Usually boys of this extraction studied diligently, obeyed school regulations to an extent that disgusted some of their Russian teachers, and later served the Tsar with the same unquestioning obedience which their relatives on the other side of the frontier displayed toward their Prussian potentates.

Baron Delvig was a different type of Baltic German. His laziness at school (and in later life) was called "phenomenal" by his teachers and friends alike; but, in the words of Pushkin, it was "noble laziness." He was the first to fully appreciate the genius of Pushkin. Under the influence of his friend, he, too, became a poet—although a minor one, partial to bucolic themes and folkish Russian forms, in which he succeeded so well that some of his pieces still are sung as folk-songs in Russia. He died early, at the age of thirty-two, and after his death Pushkin felt that his turn must be near:

"And now, I feel, my hour is near.

When will it come? Today, tomorrow?

He waits for me, companion dear

Of youthful joys and youthful sorrow."

Delvig did not have to wait long—only five years—before his friend followed him into untimely death.

The third of the schoolmates whom Pushkin saw during his exile at Mikhailovskoe was Prince Gorchakov, "to riches born and fame." At the Lyceum, this offspring of one of the noblest families of Russia looked like "a young god"; he studied (and behaved) so well that the authorities had some difficulty in not awarding him the first prize—an award which could have been interpreted as favoritism, because of Gorchakov's social position. Pushkin was attracted by Gorchakov's brilliance and beauty, but other comrades disliked him for being, in the words of one of them, "vain, petty, and assuming."

In 1825, Gorchakov was already far advanced along a diplomatic career. He was an attaché at the Russian embassy in London and came to the countryside near Pskov—not to see Pushkin, but to spend his vacations with an uncle who was Pushkin's neighbor. Pushkin himself hurried to visit his brilliant schoolmate. Of this meeting, to

which
"V
dried
do no
two."

Go
the P
impo
his v
Tyut
finest
cissus
he di
friend
chako
celeb

TH
stanza
1820
hours

and c
be ab

TH
Maty
upon
chatk
(181
he p
wher
Aege
reve
heari
you
Yako

"M
Will
thin,
ject
excit
than

which Pushkin refers in stanza X, he wrote in a letter:

"We met and parted rather coldly, at least on my side. He has dried out terribly—perhaps, this is as it should be. We in the North do not mature, but either dry or rot, the first is still the better of the two."

Gorchakov went far. He became Foreign Minister, Chancellor of the Empire, highest dignitary in the government of two Tsars, an important figure on the international scene. He was famous for his vanity and the elaborate literary style of his diplomatic notes. Tyutchev, the diplomat and wit, who in his spare time wrote the finest Russian poetry after Pushkin, called Gorchakov "the Narcissus of the Inkpot." Gorchakov survived all his fellow-alumni; he died in his eighty-seventh year. He thus became the "unlucky friend" of the last two stanzas of Pushkin's poem. Did Prince Gorchakov remember these stanzas on October 19, 1882, when he celebrated the last Lyceum anniversary of his life?

The "singer sweet and free," whose death Pushkin laments in stanza IV, was Korsakov, who died of consumption in Florence in 1820. Pushkin did not know, when he wrote this stanza, that a few hours before his death Korsakov composed the following epitaph:

"Oh traveller, hurry home, to reach your native land;

'tis sad to die alone, away from home and friend,"

and copied these lines in large letters so that Italian masons would be able to reproduce the Russian characters on his gravestone.

The "lover of foreign skies," addressed in stanzas V and VI, was Matyushkin, a quiet and honest man and a true friend. Immediately upon graduation he joined Captain Golovin's expedition to Kamchatka and Alaska, followed by a circumnavigation of the globe (1817-1819), which brought him to America. Later (1820-1824) he participated in Wrangel's expedition to the Arctic coast of Siberia, where a cape was named in his honor. Still later he fought in the Aegean and became an admiral. His feelings for Pushkin were best revealed in his lament to Yakovlev, secretary of their reunions, upon hearing of Pushkin's death: "Pushkin killed! Yakovlev! How could you permit this? What scoundrel could raise his hand against him? Yakovlev, Yakovlev, how did you let this happen?"

"My brother twin in Art and Destiny" in stanzas XIII-XIV, was Wilhelm Küchelbecker, a man as incongruous as his name—long, thin, ugly, hard of hearing, with an endless nose; an eternal subject of jokes, epigrams, and pranks of his friends. Sentimental and excitable, he once challenged Pushkin, whom he admired more than anybody else in the world, to a duel. The two met, and Küchel-

becker actually shot at his idol—fortunately, he missed. Instead of shooting in his turn, Pushkin said: “now, my dear, let’s go and drink tea together.” This experience did not prevent Pushkin from continuing to drive his friend mad with epigrams. It was a great and unexpected moment in Küchelbecker’s life when he heard himself addressed by Pushkin as a “brother twin”; but Pushkin’s letters contain many indications that he was genuinely fond of his quixotic friend.

Heroic and ridiculous, Küchelbecker participated in the Decembrist insurrection. Pushchin wrote from jail to the former Director of the Lyceum Engelhardt: “If I could only tell you of all the silly things which Wilhelm did on the day of the incident¹ as well as on the day when we were sentenced, you would die of laughter—although he was then in a rather tragic position.”

Küchelbecker spent ten years in different prisons and the rest of his life in Siberia. There he married an entirely uneducated woman, begot children, froze and hungered, wrote poems not less pathetic (but slightly more grammatical) than at the Lyceum, and altogether remained the same Don Quixote at whom everybody laughed, but whom everybody liked and a few, among them Pushkin, genuinely loved and respected.

¹This word was used throughout the proceedings of the Investigating Commission to designate the Decembrist rebellion.

G
ninet
ple in
and
and
Chin
In
Sovie
After
write
Civil
come
lost
merc
that
lution
emig
ome
offici
who
men
not
not
creat
coun
in w
eith
critic
shov

Russian Emigres in Western European Literature

BY VERA ALEXANDROVA

GREAT ships require deep waters and leave a large wake. The Russian Revolution left in its path a numerically great and politically variegated emigration. In the beginning of the nineteen-twenties this emigration numbered about two million people in various countries. One large group settled in the Baltic states and in Poland, another went to the Balkans, a third to Germany and France, while others made their way through Siberia reaching China and America.

In the only work about the Russian emigration published in the Soviet Union, a treatise by Vadim Belov (*The Whites' Morning After: The Russian Emigrés at the Crossroads*, Moscow, 1923), the writer sums up the spirit of the emigrés after their collapse in the Civil War as follows: "All ideas compromised, all principles become ridiculous, all leaders dethroned, all hopes failed, all unity lost, the very soil gone from under foot. . . ." But in spite of this merciless characterization, Belov seems nevertheless to recognize that a future historian working on the problems of the Russian Revolution will be obliged to spend some time in the examination of the emigration and its causes. Moreover, feeling himself that this phenomenon is more complicated than it is always represented by Soviet officials, Belov expresses his firm conviction that sooner or later the whole emigration problem will be liquidated by the Soviet government. Since then twenty years have past. And yet the problem has not been solved. During these two decades Russian emigrés have not only shown an astonishing capacity for survival, and a richness in creative forces, but have left a visible trace in the life of the many countries which sheltered them. They succeeded even in establishing in world opinion a good name for themselves. This is not the place either for a political judgment on the Russian emigration, or for a critique of Russian writers abroad. This article aims only at a sketch showing how Russian emigrés have been interpreted by foreign

writers.

In the beginning, when the Russian emigrés overran Europe, the man in the street thought of them all as former "aristocrats." This naive opinion is shown in the play of Walter Mehring *The Merchant of Berlin* (1924). At one of the railroad stations of the German capital two porters waiting for the East-express are discussing the possibilities of making some money. One of them is planning, as soon as the express stops, to run to the first class carriages, but his comrade disillusiones him. "From those passengers you cannot make a pot of money, because they all are relics, princes." And he is right. The "relics," wearing fur coats, carry their own luggage.

The proprietor of a humble hotel in the centre of Paris (in *The Street of the Fishing Cat* by Földes) explains to his listeners that he respects Lenin: formerly Lenin himself lived like a poor devil in an emigré's hotel, and now he has succeeded "in sending us the Russian aristocracy."

But shortly after the first contact had been established these naive notions were destroyed: "Only people who proceed by way of easy but always artificial analogies can fit such a complicated phenomenon as the Russian emigration into the same categories as our old emigrés from the French Revolution ("Russian Emigration" in *Revue des Sciences Politiques*, Paris, 1922).

Although Germany sheltered in the early nineteen twenties about 300,000 Russian emigrés, she showed little interest in them. The literature of that period gives a key to this callousness. Defeated in the First World War, the Germans were in bad humor with the whole world, with but one exception, Russia. This is shown in one of the first novels published after the war's end, Kellermann's *The Ninth of November*. The Germans were grateful to Soviet Russia for the separate peace of Brest-Litovsk. It was almost generally felt that William II had committed a big error in fighting against Russia instead of making her Germany's ally. "Never would Bismarck have committed such a mistake." These ideas were enlarged by observations brought home from the Eastern front (see, for instance, *Carl and Anna* by Leonhard Frank). For all their poverty and cultural backwardness, the Russian people deeply impressed the German soldiers and officers by their sincerity, gentleness, humanity. This is magnificently shown in Arnold Zweig's novel *Sergeant Grisha*. These were the reasons why, in German opinion, the Russian Revolution in its Bolshevik aspect seemed *all right*.

For the left wing of German society and its writers (Ernst Toller, Erich Mühsam, Brecht, etc.), the Russian Revolution was the in-

carnation of a new socialist epoch. But even the extreme right wing was benevolent in its estimates. Thus, in his novel, *The Outlaws* (1930), the well known nationalistic writer, Ernst von Salomon, once connected with the circle which organized the murder of German Minister Walter Rathenau, interpreted the October Revolution as "the historic form of Russia's national revolution." Such a radical nationalistic revolution, said he, has always been the dream of German youth.

A somewhat different attitude is shown in the novel of Edwin Dwinger *Between White and Red* (1930). Dwinger himself took part in the Civil War on the side of the Whites in Siberia, where he was living as a prisoner of war. Later he wrote down his experiences in the form of a novel. Many episodes of this book are pictured not without certain vigour, especially the famous four thousand miles retreat of the White Army accomplished within six weeks in the grim conditions of Siberian winter. Although Dwinger's sympathy for the Whites is obvious, he is far from idealizing them. Sometimes he even suggests that their defeat was inevitable because the Reds were supported by the peasantry. The artistic quality of the novel is impaired by one peculiarity which is characteristic of many German writers. An accidental participant in the gigantic struggle, Dwinger obviously was impressed more by the magnificence of the grim and majestic landscape against which it took place, than by the conflict itself. To its real issues he remained indifferent. All that he and his German comrades really loved was their own country; all their prayers can be reduced to one: may such disorders as these not overrun Germany.

Outside the big stream of German prewar-literature stands Erich Maria Remarque, the author of the famous novel *All Quiet on the Western Front*. Remarque voluntarily emigrated from Germany shortly before Hitler came to power. In 1941, he published a novel *Flotsam* dedicated to the new German emigration which started soon after the beginning of Hitler's Third Reich. Among many portraits of the hunted fugitives we find a Russian emigré, Lilo, whose portrait seems to be drawn in soft India ink. Russian to the core, Lilo is in love with a German revolutionary, Steiner. But she is more genuine than he. Steiner always fears to show his weakness while Lilo says: "In Russia men could weep and still be men and still be brave."

Among the countries which gave refuge to Russians it was France that perhaps paid them the most attention. For this there were special reasons. The close relations between Russia and France antedated

the Revolution. For the higher social strata in old Russia the French language meant almost more than their native tongue. On the other hand, Russian democratic and revolutionary circles were accustomed to see in France the birthplace of the great Revolution. Long before their eventual victory generations of Russian revolutionary exiles used to find shelter in France. On the other hand, there existed in France a fairly numerous contingent of Russia's devoted friends. In an interesting article, "Why the French Like Russia?" (*Le Monde Slave*, 1925), Jules Legras reveals a large, almost unknown, army of Russia's admirers recruited from people who had spent some time in Russia as tutors, governesses, and educators and, after their return, spread the seeds of sympathy for Russia among the people. The mechanism of those feelings—according to Legras—is not complicated. Most of these admirers, of humble origin and modest education, when living in Russia as tutors and governesses, came in close touch with aristocratic and wealthy Russian society. They enjoyed this social elevation, and later in their memories it colored their optimistic impressions of the whole of Russia. But besides those naive protagonists of Russia in France, there was also a considerable group of writers, artists and scientists who were interested in Russian culture and especially in Russian literature.

These previously accumulated impressions helped French public opinion to surmount even the deep disappointment which arose from the foreign policy of the Soviet government in the first years of the Revolution. At first, French sympathy for Russian emigrés was nourished from two sources, old traditional feelings, and a desire to manifest disapproval of the Soviet government. Immediate contact with Russian emigrés soon created a third source of sympathy which was made clear by the French literature of the period.

Josef Kessel's *The Nights Of The Princes* (1927) shows life in a respectable hotel in a quiet street in Paris. Its owner, Mlle Mesureux, had consented not without great hesitation, to take in a young Russian emigré working as a night driver. Soon he brings all his friends to the hotel, and the house completely loses its once so respectable atmosphere. Although the new inhabitants bring with them much noise and trouble, Mlle Mesureux likes them. They impress her because she feels "they are more naked, more stripped than other people. . . They seem defenseless for the very reason of their ingenuity. And little by little she becomes accustomed to their faces, begins to take an interest in their stories. Without knowing it Mlle Mesureux begins to love them." The same feelings sometimes animate the people on the street. Looking on these emigrés,

women often shake their heads and exclaim: *Les Russes!*—"as if this name with its suggestion of unhappiness, mystery, grandeur, was enough to make them accept without protest actions most disturbing to their own peace." The most interesting Russian pictured in this novel is a former Siberian merchant of peasant background, Irtysh. One of his friends, a former aristocrat Shuvalov (now a night driver), characterizes him as follows: "He is so Russian! Not of our intellectual and spoiled kind, but much better. With people like him even if the worst occurs, still Russia will not perish."

It is worth noticing one feature of these emigré characters which is repeatedly observed by many writers. The Russian emigrés are shown as deeply patriotic. Some writers demonstrate how this feeling, rooted in the emigrant's soul, comforts him in the most bitter hours of his existence. This feature is most sharply shown in the well-known play of Jacques Deval *Tovarich* (1935). The reader might remember that at the end of this play the former Tsarist general Uratiev finds a common ground with the Soviet commissar Gorodchenko. Shaking hands with "Comrade Gorodchenko," Uratiev says sadly: "Once there existed Great Russia. She still exists, but besides her exist everywhere—in Vienna, in London, in New York, in Paris—a series of little Russias. . . I am the Russia of yesterday, you are that of today. But many signs lead me to believe that neither you nor I are the Russia of tomorrow."

Russian emigrés are portrayed perhaps with the greatest warmth in the novel *The Street Of The Fishing Cat* by the Hungarian woman writer, Jolan Földes. A Hungarian worker's family blessed with many children decides to leave their country and search for work and fortune abroad. They come to Paris and take a room in a humble hotel in the heart of the *Cité*, near Notre-Dame. This hotel is in its own way a faithful political barometer: "Victorious revolutions, defeated revolutions, the result is almost the same. A smaller or larger group of men takes flight like scattered rabbits." And because the Russian Revolution is a great one, the group of "scattered rabbits" is especially large: former bankers, officers, aristocrats, workers. Now they are almost equal, and in the new conditions of life some fundamental and positive traits of Russian nature come to the fore in all of them. Thus the former banker "uncle Bardichinov" helps the Hungarian family to find jobs, to learn French, to educate the children. So too, the mechanic Vasya is the pet of the entire hotel population. "Why did Vasya leave Russia?" asks Anna, the young Hungarian girl. "A workman could remain there." She is convinced that some mystery envelops Vasya's past, at least he must have been

"a grand duke." But Bardichinov tries to explain to her that Vasya's gentleness is a familiar feature of Russian simple folk. The Russian people—says he—are like children, and there are men among them "around whom the atmosphere grows luminous."

The sudden death of Vasya in a street accident is a hard blow for the whole hotel population. This tragic end is used by the writer to show the Russian colony conducting their countryman to his rest forever. In reality Vasya's "mystery" was a simple and humble one. He was not "a grand duke" at all! "He took part in the socialist movement, he fought with enthusiasm for the revolution, and then, when they had triumphed, he suddenly realized that it was not what he had imagined. . . Vasya had turned against his party, and fled from the country where his revolution had triumphed." Not claiming to prove any political dogma, Földes makes very important observations concerning the Russian emigrés. In portraying Vasya, the writer throws some light on the psychological cause of the emigration.

Seldom are there foreign writers who are really interested in revealing the inner problems and conflicts of the Russian Revolution. One type of exception is *False Passports* (1938), by the Belgian novelist Plisnier and *Darkness at Noon* by the Austrian refugee Koestler. Both former Communists, they attempt to explain the enigmatic "confessions" of the ex-leaders of the October Revolution in the Moscow trials of 1936. But neither of these novels deals with Russian emigrés.

Of special interest is, therefore, the play *Tsar Lenin* (1931) by François Porché. Porché's interest in Russia dates from long before 1917. He visited the country, lived there for five years, and studied Russia's language and literature. All he had seen in old Russia gave him the firm conviction that a great revolution was under way. But he was expecting a revolution akin to the French one. The October revolution changed in a few months the face of what Porché and the whole world were expecting. So Porché decided to study this phenomenon. He started with Lenin in whom he recognized the main driving force of the revolution. Working on his character, François Porché turned to Martov, the leader of the Russian Social Democratic party, who once was a close friend of Lenin's, but later became his adversary, emigrated, and died in Germany, in 1923.

The four acts of Porché's play show the decisive moments in Lenin's life. The culminating point comes in the third act. The victorious revolution again is in danger. General Yudenich is at the gates of Petrograd. The leading men of the Communist party—

Kame
to spe
Octob
decide
capital
vision
Lenin
answe
—he
last d
rov in
geois
conclu
dom y
view:
becau
Lenin
a long
only
promp
the un
you b
popul
is a sr
In
mend
seque
mean
name
mora
sion I
Mart
thoug
been
why
woul
W
main
only
solve
world
vivid

Kamenev, Rykov, Dzerzhinsky, Bukharin—come to the Kremlin to speak with Lenin. What is to be done? Shall the cradle of the October Revolution be defended, or must it be surrendered? Lenin decides to organize a defense by mobilizing the proletariat of the capital. They go out. Tired, Lenin falls asleep. Suddenly a strange vision troubles him. Martov's shadow appears in Lenin's room. Lenin asks him how could he penetrate into his room? Martov answers: "As remorse penetrates the conscience." But Lenin replies—he has no remorse at all. Well—says Martov—then perhaps "a last doubt?" But Lenin denies any doubt. This statement gives Martov the opportunity to point out Lenin's errors: "Because the bourgeois were always using freedom hypocritically, you came to the conclusion that freedom was a bourgeois idea. In repudiating freedom you renounced yourself." Now Lenin makes clear his point of view: freedom was an excellent thing, but he could not let it triumph, because then freedom would have destroyed him. Up to this point, Lenin is satisfied with what was done in October, although it is still a long way to the end, because "the great October Revolution was only a beginning. Its purpose is a universal revolution." Martov promptly retorts: "The October Revolution has nothing to do with the universal. It seems great to you because Russia is vast and because you betrayed and succeeded in leading into error a tremendous population; but from the point of view of the spirit, your revolution is a small one."

In the introduction to his play, Porché openly recognizes the tremendous amplitude of the October Revolution and its gigantic consequences not only for Russia but for the entire world. But in the meantime he cannot forget one tragic phenomenon of this revolution, namely, that it involves a dangerous revaluation of "a series of moral values on which the modern world has been based." In conclusion Porché says: "In spirit and in heart we are with the shadow of Martov when he visits the sleeping Lenin. I agree with Martov's thoughts and feelings but with a regret—that the *force of will* has been on the side of his adversary. Freedom is a beautiful thing. But why was there not found in Russia someone equal to Lenin who would defend it?"

With this fundamental question Porché comes very close to the main conflict of the Russian Revolution. The Russian emigration is only one of its results. So long as the problem of freedom is not solved, there always will be, somewhere in the wide spaces of the world, people loving and yearning for their country from afar, as a vivid incarnation of this tragic conflict.

The Russian Folk-Song

BY NINA VERNADSKY

THE folk-song is one of the greatest artistic achievements of the Russian people, both in poetry and in music. In this song word and melody are inseparable. The Russian proverb says, "Not a word can be omitted from a song." Every word has its meaning, and it is the word which fixes the melody in people's minds. Poetry in itself is the beginning of a song. In the old Russian folk-song words and melody are so closely interwoven that they appear to have been born together.

Generally, every musical person can appreciate any musical work, be it native or foreign. For a full appreciation of a Russian song, however, it should be heard in its place of birth, sung by those who have created it. The Russian song was born and sung in the open fields, and it has its roots in Mother Earth. For those born in that land this song symbolizes the Russian nature and the Russian people. I have only to close my eyes and recall some plaintive Russian song to see immediately the black earth, the wide fields, the rising sun and the green grass blown by the morning wind, the larks high up in the blue sky, the cattle in the fields, the peasant carts and the groups of peasant women in their colorful dress. The whole picture of Russian village life arises before my eyes.

II

The song is the living chronicle of the Russian people. From time immemorial Russians have marked in song the whole course of their lives—work and play, joy and sorrow, small things and big historical events.

Of course, in our day, under the impact of industrialization and mechanized civilization, and especially under the influence of "learned" musical technique, the folk-song is radically changing in character. The old song is losing its contact with life and getting away from its sources. It is becoming a precious relic of antiquity, an object for study by the specialist in folk-lore, but has ceased to be a living thing. Even in this period of dying, however, the old song

is still
musical
The
many
but in
structu
the un
other
the Te
to the
sleep
were s
day fe
family
orate
of bur
But
protes
southe
paid t
arterie
popula
Dnepr
the de
adven
ular i
dedica
again
the so
Kiev
sovere
Alexa
of Ale
rise to
refuse
and w
under
Alexa
ing w
Am
tents
writte

is still able to inspire Russian composers by its melodies and its whole musical structure.

The old Russian song has lived for centuries, going through many changes, adding much that was new to its ancient treasure, but in substance remaining the same song with the same musical structure. I have in mind, of course, the song of the country-side—the urban song (that of the artisans and the workers) is quite another matter. In the days of Nicholas II, just as in the days of Ivan the Terrible, the whole life of a peasant family in Russia went along to the accompaniment of song. From birth, the child was hushed to sleep by a lullaby; later he sang as he played. When an adult, there were songs to accompany his work and others to celebrate his holiday festivities. There were songs for each season of the year. Every family event was marked by a song, and there was an especially elaborate cycle of songs for the wedding. At the close of life, the ritual of burial included definite forms of “lamentations.”

But it was not only family events that were reflected in song. The protest against serfdom, and the longing for the free life of the southern steppes also found their expression in song. Other songs paid tribute to the beauty of the great Russian rivers, the mighty arteries of Russian national life. Mother Volga was one of the most popular subjects of the Great Russian folk-songs, and the “glorious Dnepr” of the Ukrainian songs. There also were songs telling of the deeds of Cossack atamans, famous robbers, and young merchant-adventurers—all those who by their acts of daring impressed popular imagination. Other songs glorified tsars and princes or were dedicated to such historical events as the Mongol invasion or wars against foreigners. The series of these historical songs begins with the so-called *byliny*, which told of the exploits of princes of the Kiev period, with Vladimir the Saint as the favorite hero. Among sovereigns of later periods, Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great, and Alexander I—all became subjects of folk-songs. The sudden death of Alexander I apparently struck the popular imagination and gave rise to a feeling of an unsolved mystery. As is known, many people refused to believe that Alexander I really died in Taganrog in 1825, and when somewhat later a mysterious “elder” appeared in Siberia under the name of Fedor Kuzmich the idea originated that he was Alexander. These rumors were reflected in a number of songs dealing with Alexander’s death that appeared at the time.

Among military songs one of the most interesting, both in contents and form, is a song dealing with a threatening letter allegedly written by a foreign potentate (the King of Sweden, the King of

Prussia, or the "Tsar of Turkey") to the Russian Emperor (Empress). This song apparently came into being in the middle of the eighteenth century, in the days of Empress Elizabeth.¹

One of its versions sounds almost prophetic, as though written in anticipation of present events. In this song the Prussian king writes in his letter as follows:

Wait till I gather my strength:
I'll come o'er hill and dale,
I'll dine in Petersburg
And sup in Moscow.

The Russian Empress becomes alarmed, but she is reassured by one of her generals:

Have no fear, oh Mother, of the Prussian King!
The hound will never come to Petersburg,
Never will he set foot there
Nor ever set eyes on Moscow.

Because of the variety of the old Russian songs, both in regard to their contents and their melody, they are not easy to classify, and many different systems of classification have been suggested by students of the Russian folk-songs. In any case one can distinguish two main groups: village (peasant) and town (artisan) songs. Of a more recent origin are the factory songs, under the influence of which there developed also a new type of village song—the so-called *chastushky* (ditties). In contents one can distinguish the following types of songs: the epic (*byliny*), the historical, the lyrical, the ritual, and finally the songs connected with everyday life (dance songs, work songs, humorous songs, etc.)

III

The old Russian song has its own melodic, harmonic and rhythmic peculiarities. Its melody is based on a system of tetrachords. Most Great Russian songs, including some of the oldest—wedding and other ritual songs, are composed in the so-called pentatonic scale: a major scale with the fourth and seventh degrees omitted. This scale is to be found in the folk music of the Turkic tribes in the basins of the Volga and Kama rivers, among the Bashkirs, Siberian Tartars, in Central Asia, Siam, Burma, and Indo-China. Thus, the

¹It is interesting to note that the contents (not the melody) of this Russian song are similar to that of some old Serbian and Bosnian songs. It is possible that the words of the song were brought to Russia by the Serbian military colonists who were settled in the Ukraine by the government of Empress Elizabeth.

source
Orient
few v
more
in the
Altho
tonic
a succ
colori
words
ments
sides
also a
chord
Ver
Most
each
song
singer
effect
Th
border
backw
ciful
who a
phony
folk-s
Russi
Bachs

Th
rhyth
deper
ator a
meas
it can
Russi
perfo
itate
to th

sources of Russian folk-songs can, in some measure, be traced to the Orient. In the Ukraine the pentatonic scale is to be found only in a few very ancient songs, while among the other Slavs its use is even more rare. It is interesting to note that it has been preserved also in the Celtic folk-song, among the Scotch, the Irish, and in Brittany. Although not all the Great Russian songs are composed in the pentatonic scale, they are all characterized by the diatonic mode, that is by a succession of intervals mostly in whole tones, and by the lack of coloring intervals in semitones and one and a half tones. In other words, the Russian folk-song is predominantly diatonic, and elements of chromaticism are very rare. It must be noted also that besides the usual major and minor modes the Russian folk-song uses also alternating modes (on the tonal foundation of the seventh chord).

Very remarkable are the harmonic peculiarities of Russian songs. Most of them are polyphonic. All the parts are independent, and each has a beauty of its own, but all go to make up the whole. The song is begun by the leader who carries the main theme. The other singers modulate and embellish it to create an original contrapuntal effect.

The harmonic richness and originality of the Russian folk-song borders on the miraculous. One wonders how an "illiterate and backward" people could create such a remarkably complex and fanciful art. If compared with the folk-songs of the Oriental peoples who all sing in unison, or with the Western type of scholarly polyphony, it is strikingly original. It can be said that the old Russian folk-song, along with the old church vocal music is, in a sense, Russia's classical music, and that its unknown creators are the Russian Bachs and Beethovens.

IV

The rhythmic side of Russian song is also highly original. Its rhythm is partly determined by the nature of the living tongue, but depends also, in a great degree, on the artistic intuition of the creator and performer. It is difficult to divide a Russian folk-tune into measures in accordance with the laws of European music. But still it can be said that the measures in $5/4$ and $7/4$ are typical of Great Russian songs. Because of the peculiar character of the rhythm the performance of these songs presents great difficulties for the uninitiated. So much depends on the performer that he must belong to the land of their creation and be intimately familiar with their

native setting. Songs born in the fields, with their wide range of melody and rhythm and their limitless possibilities of variation, can be sung properly only in the fields. They demand wide spaces and mighty voices—hence the popular Russian expression “to shout the song.” Naturally, one cannot shout in a room or even in a concert hall. Dancing songs, on the contrary, with their rippling melodies and dainty embellishments, can be properly performed indoors. These require a special style of performance. The softest of all the songs is naturally the lullaby. Its melody is usually based on only two or three notes, and this is not a mark of primitiveness but rather an artistic device to suit the melody to the occasion.

V

It is difficult to discuss in a foreign language the peculiarities of the wording of Russian folk-songs as the original text in most cases defies translation. One has to limit oneself to a few generalities. Like the harmony and the melody of the Russian song, its verbal texture has its own laws and traditions. The most ancient songs served as models for the later ones. Of course, in the songs of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries one can find many new terms which have been added to the Russian language only since the days of Peter the Great. And yet the basic texture remains the same: the same turns of phrase; the same images, metaphors, epithets; the same traditional combinations of words, forming, one might say, verbal chords. For instance the sea is always “blue sea,” the fields are always “open fields.” Youth and maiden are never mentioned otherwise than as “worthy youth” and “fair maiden.” In fact nearly each word has its invariable epithet: white hands, blue flowers, silken grass, etc.

Among other characteristic devices one can mention fixed combinations of certain nouns, which always appear paired together; repetition of certain words from one line of the song to the next, which gives the effect of waves following each other; and finally, the frequent use of alliteration.

VI

Up to recent times both the creation and transmission of Russian folk-songs remained oral. Neither the words nor the music were written down but were transmitted from one singer to another from generation to generation. The writing down of words and music

started
educa
a curi
songs
Archa
with

The
made
throp
begin
name
volum
of the
publi
music
down
defini
tion

In
of Ru
publi
collec
Kiree
big co
by D
defec
which
izatio
Ther
N. M
one t
was t
(her
great
with
The
know
was
note
made
Happ
she w

started relatively late, and it was the work of outsiders from the educated class—lovers of music, scholars, and ethnographers. It is a curious fact that the first transcription of words of Russian folk-songs was made for an English traveller, Richard James, who visited Archangel in 1620. This was the text of six historical songs dealing with the Times of Trouble.

The first known collection of Russian songs, mostly historical, was made in the 1730's by order of a Ural manufacturer and philanthropist P. A. Demidov. It was not published, however, until the beginning of the nineteenth century when it appeared under the name of Kirsha Danilov. In 1770-74 there was published a six-volume collection by M. D. Chulkov which contained only the text of the songs. One of the first collections of songs with music was published in 1790 by I. Pratsch, born in Silesia and a teacher of music. Later critics found that only some of the tunes were written down by Pratsch quite exactly, and that his harmonization was of a definitely Western European type, so that many songs in his collection lost their peculiar Russian character.

In the course of the nineteenth century, study and transcription of Russian songs made very substantial progress, and there were published many collections of both text and music. Among the collections of text one should single out those of Iakushkin (1860), Kireevsky (edited by Bezsonov, 1860-74), Shein (1870). The next big collection of songs with music after that of Pratsch was compiled by D. Kashin (1833, 2nd edition 1841), but it shared many of the defects of its predecessor. The first collection of songs with music which gave an exact notation of melody and a more suitable harmonization was the work of the composer M. A. Balakirev (1866). There followed collections of N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov (1877), Yu. N. Melgunov (1879-1885), and T. I. Filipov (1882). In the last one the songs were harmonized by Rimsky-Korsakov. E. E. Lineva was the first to use a phonograph for the recording of folk-songs (her collection was published in 1909 and reissued in 1921). Of great importance is *The Description of a Russian Peasant Wedding*, with text and music, compiled by O. Agreneva-Slavyanskaya (1889). The songs in this volume were written down as sung by a well-known peasant singer of the Olonetsk province, I. A. Fedosova, who was particularly famous for her "lamentations." It is interesting to note that this woman greatly influenced the poet Nekrasov, who made use of several of her "lamentations" in his poem "Who is Happy in Russia." Fedosova lived to be over a hundred. In 1896 she was heard by Gorky who later described her in *Klim Samgin*.

Book Reviews

JOESTEN, JOACHIM. *What Russia Wants*. New York, Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1944. 214 pp. \$2.50.

DALLIN, DAVID J. *Russia and Post-War Europe*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1943. 230 pp. \$2.75.

Here are two authors—objective and well-informed—earnestly seeking to resolve the famous “riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma,” but for all their very real success in clarifying both the past and present of Soviet Russia’s foreign policy, its possible future contours still remain hazy and indistinct. How could it be otherwise? Obviously Soviet policy will be determined in large part by events that even Stalin cannot now foresee, by imponderables which can totally change the world picture almost overnight. And not the least of these imponderables is perhaps the even greater riddle of American foreign policy!

Mr. Joesten is far more successful in the clarity of the picture that emerges from *What Russia Wants* than is Mr. Dallin in the possibly more searching but somewhat confused *Russia and the Postwar World*. The former book, having the advantage of being written after the Moscow and Teheran conferences, is also more hopeful in its outlook. Without minimizing the knotty problems in postwar relations for which no definite solution now appears to be in sight, it nevertheless ends upon a note of promise in reviewing the Teheran declaration—“this is a great step

forward on the right road.” Mr. Dallin, on the other hand, finds nothing in the record to justify any expectation of Soviet collaboration in an effective world organization for peace. On almost the last page he does mention the possibility that Russia might turn toward a more cooperative political course than that which he finds dictated by the traditional trends of Soviet policy. His scepticism is so strong, however, that one may well doubt whether Moscow and Teheran have altered his pessimistic opinions.

On the immediate objectives of Soviet policy the two authors are generally agreed. Stalin is determined to obtain for Russia what he considers her strategic frontiers, including the Baltic states, eastern Poland and the 1940 Russo-Finnish boundary, and to establish a sphere of influence in eastern Europe that would preclude the formation of potentially hostile federations among her neighbor states. And both authors would agree that he is likely to secure these objectives. (“For what Stalin says in the U.S.S.R. goes,” Mr. Joesten writes bluntly. “And what the U.S.S.R. says is likely to go in the postwar world.”) From this point on they begin to part company. Whereas Mr. Joesten finds no basis for believing that the Russian dictator aspires either to communize or Russify the rest of Europe, Mr. Dallin discredits the idea that the Soviet’s present emphasis on Russian nationalism bars a program of aggressive expansion. He further feels that her apparent support for democracy in neigh-

boring countries marks a first step toward bringing such nations within the Soviet fold.

As to the future course of Russo-German relations, both recognize the possibility of an accord directed against a postwar Anglo-American entente. Mr. Joesten believes that this danger can be exorcised if the United States and Great Britain will recognize what he considers Russia's legitimate demands in eastern Europe. Mr. Dallin appears to have little confidence in any way of forestalling such an eventuality. On the assumption that Germany will become the scene of stormy popular movements tending toward communism, he foresees Stalin endeavoring to convert probable collaboration with her into a hard-and-fast military alliance.

Mr. Joesten follows a straightforward, clear path in *What Russia Wants*. He outlines the Soviet Union's relations with Germany, Poland, the Baltic states, and Finland; then takes up its rôle in the Balkans and in the Far East, and concludes with a chapter under the heading "Can We Do Business with Stalin?" His material is well organized and well written. His realistic appraisal of existing facts, and suggestions upon how American policy might be directed in the face of such facts along the road of collaboration with Russia, make his book a constructive contribution to discussion of what is perhaps the most vital problem in the realm of international affairs.

Mr. Dallin is more concerned with basic concepts, with the philosophy of communism, with long-term trends of policy in *Russia and Postwar Europe*. This interesting material could have been better organized, however. The author is sometimes repetitious. Except that

they are so pessimistic as to the possibility of future peace, his conclusions often appear contradictory. While he tries to consider every possibility in regard to future political alignments, the underlying motif in his interpretation is found in repeated emphatic statements that Soviet Russia has no faith in the durability of postwar alliances, and is not prepared to conclude any agreements except of the most limited content.

This attitude could have an unhappy effect in tending to produce the very state of affairs to which it points with alarm. It holds out so little encouragement for future collaboration that readers of *Russia and Postwar Europe* may well wonder why the United States should even try to meet the Soviet Union half way. To this reviewer the approach to the problem in *What Russia Wants* is no less realistic because it holds out the hope that on the basis of their common interest in peace both Soviet Russia and the United States should be able to stand together in the future as they so often have stood together in the past. "Where there's a will," Mr. Joesten concludes, "there's a way."

FOSTER RHEA DULLES
Ohio State University.

CHAMBERLIN, WILLIAM HENRY.
The Russian Enigma. New York, Scribner, 1943. 321 pp. \$2.75.

The author of the excellent *The Russian Revolution, 1917-1921*, and the incisive *Russia's Iron Age* has written another remarkable book.

The lucid analysis of contemporary Russia, achieved with a rare economy of means in the chapters of *The Russian Enigma*, is a refreshing change from the semi—or complete—ignorance of many an

"expert" commentator on the contemporary Russian scene, whose verbose volumes are cluttering bookstore windows these days.

Mr. Chamberlin's work seems to fall into two major parts: a) what Russia is like today and b) how it grew into its present shape. The last chapter, "Russia in the post-war world," is in the nature of a leap into the dark, an attempt at a prognosis based on knowledge of the past and a close study of the present.

The chapters on Russian government, economy, foreign policy, the purge, armed forces, the course of the Russo-German hostilities and the sources of Russian strength offer in their all too brief pages an exceptionally well-informed and penetrating review of these topics.

The social consequences of the Constitution of 1936, so often overlooked, are given attention by the author, who points out that it has served "the constructive purpose of ending the old habit of harrying and persecuting the disfranchised classes."

As to the results of the economic planning of the Soviets, Mr. Chamberlin remarks that they have disappointed the hope of the radicals and the fear of the conservatives that a state-directed economy would lead to material equality. To this, perhaps, could be offered the commentary that the process is still going on. The author himself readily agrees, however, that Russia "has taken a flying start on the road towards the industrial civilization for which the country seems predestined" by its resources, vast territory and large population.

Recently a great deal has been written and spoken on Soviet foreign policy. Mr. Chamberlin's own summary strikes this reviewer as

one remarkably objective and penetrating. At the same time one cannot help wondering whether Soviet policies, particularly the latest, can be adequately surveyed and assayed without some reference to the general *Gestalt* of the post-war world. Are we going to live in the world of "Total Peace" urged by Ely Gulbertson or in that of Senator Robert A. Taft? The latter's statement that "We did not enter the present war in order to crusade throughout the world for the Atlantic Charter or the Four Freedoms . . . we are not fighting for democracy except for our own" (*New York Times Magazine*, February 6th, 1944), might be easily interpreted as an expression of the intention of a large and influential part of the American public to let power politics set the pattern of the post-war world. There are quite a few reasons to fear that power politics will dominate international relations as long as the principle of national sovereignty, as understood at present, continues to interfere with the possibility of establishing international law on a firm foundation. Are the Soviets then to be singled out for looking for security in the light of their own historic experience?

Now a few words about the chapters comprised in the first part of the book. There is a tendency on the part of the author to overemphasize the uniqueness of some of the phases of Russian historic experience, as well as to magnify the element of state compulsion in the Russian's daily life. To cite but one example: the statement on p. 20, that no medieval Russian sovereign found himself obliged to limit his authority by signing a charter, is hardly correct. Leaving aside the well-known Novgorodian and Pskov practices, the events at Kiev

in 1
ence
offer
tion
Duk
S
ed.
of F
the
the
pose
bran
who
eith
the
a lo
as S
The
corr
Men
Le F
O
the
post
mor
earl
quite
histo
earl
him
sive
sour
tion
is ap
histo
ians
part
men
and
the
T
that
othe
to ci
Grea
"tow
alty.
ginn
Pete

in 1146 and 1147, and the experience of the Dukes Igor and Izyaslav offer excellent examples of limitations imposed on the power of the Dukes by the *veche*.

Some of the parallels are strained. Thus Mr. Chamberlin speaks of Peter the Great's destruction of the *streltsy* in the same breath with the Soviet purge. The *streltsy* opposed Peter's reforms root and branch from the outset, while those who perished in the purge were either partners in bringing about the November Revolution, or went a long way in the same direction as Stalin, before breaking with him. The parallel would be historically correct should Peter have purged *Menshikov*, *Apraksin*, *Gordon*, and *Le Fort*.

One is inclined to believe that the author's knowledge of Russian post-revolutionary history is far more complete than that of the earlier periods. This is, of course, quite natural, as Mr. Chamberlin's historic research, on which his earlier works were founded, led him to a minute and comprehensive examination of the original source material, while his information on Russia's more remote past is apparently drawn from works of historic synthesis. Russian historians are perhaps to blame for some parts of Mr. Chamberlin's commentary, as we still lack a reliable and trenchant history of Russia in the last two centuries.

There are a few errors in fact that have found their way into this otherwise admirable volume. Again to cite only one example: Peter the Great certainly did not build the "towering structure" of the Admiralty. It dates only from the beginning of the nineteenth century. Peter's Admiralty was a very mod-

est affair indeed.

These remarks should not be interpreted, however, as a reflection on the book as a whole. *The Russian Enigma* is a very important contribution towards the understanding of contemporary Russia and we should be grateful to the author for the good craftsmanship and the deep insight of his analysis.

D. FEDOTOFF WHITE

Philadelphia, Pa.

HUBBARD, LEONARD E. *Soviet Labor and Industry*. New York, Macmillan, 1943. 314 pp. \$3.25.

The Russian scene is not new to Mr. Hubbard. His family has been established in business in Russia for more than a century and he has made frequent visits to the country. His first trip was in 1904, and his last, as recorded in the book, in 1937. It is evident that he is at home in the Russian language.

The present volume is his fourth book on the Soviet Union. It is a compilation of facts and personal impressions. The facts dealing with labor relations in Soviet Russia, wages, hours of work, and the standard of living show the well known changes in the Bolshevik attitude toward the wage earners, which culminated in the final subjugation of the workers. Industry is only touched upon here and there in connection with the fluctuations in the status of the workers. The author is more interested in tracing the evolutionary transition from the original Syndicalist Communism to state capitalism than in industry. To be sure, Mr. Hubbard does not use the expression "state capitalism." He merely describes the way in which the Communists adopted capitalist methods of production and distribution and lets the reader

draw his own conclusion. The picture that emerges from Mr. Hubbard's pen is undeniably that of state capitalism; the evidence in support of his thesis is predominantly from Soviet sources and consequently irrefutable.

Mr. Hubbard's personal impressions are not as convincing. He makes too many statements which are at variance with the facts, and others which may be true but require factual corroboration. For example, he states (p.100) that Soviet workers convicted of absenteeism and undergoing correctional labor are marched to the factories under guard, and receive poorer wages, "most of which is no doubt deducted for their keep in the isolator." Now it is common knowledge that in Soviet Russia political offenders and common prisoners are kept at work, but the present reviewer has not come across any reference to cases of rent charges for prisoners in *isolators*.

Describing the Zemstvo medical service in pre-revolutionary Russia Mr. Hubbard characterizes the *feldsher* as "a surgeon's dresser, usually a peasant who had picked up a smattering of elementary doctoring through serving in the army medical service" (p. 205). Actually, according to an authoritative American source, "a *feldsher* was a cross between our nurse and junior-house staff."

On p. 28 the reader is informed that "industry and commerce in the latter half of the nineteenth century were largely in the hands of Jews, Balts and other non-Russians." As a matter of fact, the Jews controlled at the maximum about five per cent of industry and commerce and the rest of the statement is just as correct. On p. 273 Mr. Hubbard

declares that the Jews were "among the extreme of the revolutionaries, and were responsible for a large proportion of the assassinations." It is common knowledge that with very few exceptions the Jews belonged to the Bund and the Social Democrats who were categorically opposed to terror. In the long history of Russian terror, only two Jews actually perpetrated terroristic acts. It is equally unfounded that the Jews were responsible among other "wanton murder" of "murdering the Imperial family." In the local Soviet which carried out Moscow's instructions there was only one Jew among more than thirty members.

MANYA GORDON

New York City.

FEDETTOFF WHITE, D. *The Growth of the Red Army*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1944. 486 pp. \$3.75.

KERR, WALTER. *The Russian Army: Its Men, Its Leaders and Its Battles*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1944. 250 pp. \$2.75.

"This is a study in military sociology and not an attempt to write a general history of the Red Army." Not often does an author offer his readers so helping a hand. Mr. Fedetoff White's book deals chiefly with the earlier period: the Civil War, the drastic demobilization in 1921, and the relatively small peacetime army established after 1924. He offers less for the vast expansion begun in 1934, or for the purge of 1937, or for the still greater expansion begun in 1939. Thus we still have no general outline of the development of the Russian Army now in the field.

The book is strikingly free from prejudice or partisanship. The au-

thor a
militar
to dep
tisan
tempts
fact o
from c
travag
men—
he offe
effort
stands
of the
Army
"Mi
stance
making
of life
and th
the arm
As a f
is far
ers of
officers
army i
provis
shows
a natio
tution,
was w
commo
charac
strongl
division
ments—
the lar
dwindl
before
officers
classes
90 per
no oth
scanty
As
Great
lars w
numbe
social
roughl
regular

thor admires sincerely the Soviet military effort, and even when he has to depend on sources that are partisan or frankly propaganda he attempts to extract useful grains of fact or interpretation. He refrains from quashing bluntly the more extravagant claims of Soviet spokesmen—but such critical comments as he offers are discerning. His whole effort is candid and honest, and stands out in sharp contrast to most of the publicity tributes to the Red Army now in vogue.

"Military sociology" in this instance covers the human elements making up the army; the conditions of life in the period before 1934; and the endless struggle between the army and the Communist Party. As a first-hand witness, the author is far more aware than most writers of the great part played by the officers and men of the Imperial army in making up the forces improvised by the Revolution. He shows also that the old army was a national rather than a class institution, and that its social character was widely different from what is commonly affirmed. The aristocratic character of the officer corps was strongly marked in the four Guard divisions and in some cavalry regiments—but in the infantry (by far the larger branch) it had steadily dwindled during the half-century before 1914. Nor were the regular officers primarily from the wealthier classes: General Denikin wrote that 90 per cent of the line officers "had no other means of support than the scanty army pay."

As in all other armies in the Great War, moreover, these regulars were swamped by the vast number of civilian officers of every social class brought into service—roughly 250,000, as against 50,000 regulars in 1914. Relatively few

were supporters of the Bolshevik Revolution; but very few of the masses, likewise, answered the call for Red volunteers when the German peace broke down in the spring of 1918. It was then necessary to "re-mobilize" the "Tsarist" army the Bolsheviks had made every effort to destroy, and the bulk of the Red army of 1918 undoubtedly was due to that action. By August, 1920, over 48,000 "old" officers were on the rolls; and about 240,000 non-commissioned officers. The Revolution took over also "the entire machinery of the central and local military administration of old Russia. . . . This trained and experienced personnel played a very important role in keeping the machinery of the Red army working during the Civil War." The author quotes a striking conclusion of the official Soviet history: "During the period of the Civil War, the former officers formed an overwhelming majority among the commanding personnel of the Red Army."

It was a far harder task to build up the Bolshevik Party. At the beginning of 1917, according to official data, its all-Russian membership amounted to 23,600. Even a year later, when it had seized control, the orthodox proletariat amounted to only 115,000. In no time at all, the Party was vastly outnumbered by the re-mobilized (but un-Bolshevik) army; and this army, in the end, achieved the victory for the Party in the Civil War. There resulted without delay the anxiety of the Party leaders in regard to the influence of the military personnel—the rank and file no less than the officer corps. In the commonplace writings on the subject, the political Commissars are dealt with in rather fig-leaf fashion—as an incidental phenomenon in the

Soviet military régime. One of the main points of this book is that the Commissar institution was the symbol of a continuing struggle between the Communist Party and the Army. The issue was raised, formally and openly, as early as 1921. It has never closed. When the Tsarist officer personnel ceased to be a worry, the "Army opposition" arose (far more briskly) from the new officer personnel promoted from the Communist ranks; as they became more competent officers, their enthusiasm for the Party cooled.

Has this process stopped today? It went on vigorously through the decades ending in 1939—and the present volume reminds us that there occurred "Army purges" in 1921, 1924, 1929, 1933—as well as the totalitarian purge of 1937.

Not counting the *sous-officiers*, the rank and file, and the plain people, the author suggests that the 1937 purge involved "more than a score of thousands of officers and political leaders of the armed forces." It involved also almost a million members and candidates of the Communist Party. The purge, in the author's conclusion, arose from a "general political crisis" running through the Soviet régime. "What was going on in the Red Army was part and parcel of the general political situation within the Communist Party."

Mr. Walter Kerr, who arrived in Russia in November 1941, brought a fresh and wholly innocent eye to his survey of the Russian scene. The past, and most of the present, he takes for granted: the value of his book lies in its record of what he saw and of the things told him. The latter predominate — and he was not at all times qualified to be a critical listener. Without hesita-

tion, he sets down the opinion given him by a Russian General: "the Germans concentrated on the construction of trench mortars, believing it unnecessary to furnish their troops with light guns and howitzers." With this clear warning, a reader can readily discount many of the author's comments on Russian tactics and materiel.

On the other hand, he records many useful facts. We learn that in the winter of 1941 the Russians were unable to provide any air cover for the arriving Murmansk convoys and refused to allow the British to provide their own air cover: the losses of ships were so extravagant that for a time the convoys were halted. ("On one convoy of 35 ships we lost 28".) Even the delivery of badly needed Allied planes was held up because "Moscow wanted no American or British pilots flying over Russian territory." This stiff refusal to co-operate seems to have prevailed throughout 1942, and striking instances are noted.

Russian aviation the author found veiled by the closest secrecy, but he notes that "heavy bombers were seldom seen." "Russian pursuit planes did not seem to be peculiarly adapted to air warfare in Russia, where at the front there were few permanent airdromes with hard-surfaced runways, and where the pilots landed and took off from little more than huge cow pastures." If this is approximately accurate it explains a good deal. The quality of the infantry and artillery, in the author's opinion, is the strongest point in the Red army; and he sensibly brushes aside the illusion that Russia still has endless resources in man-power. He notes that from a full strength of 17,200 many divisions had dropped to 12,000, or

even
not
man-
redu
Fo
Red
penet
and
was
anyth
broug
advan
autho
and l
far-m
tion"
fall
Kren
Civil
the f
to y
the l

Can

SUM
R
H

Isw
N
19

M
exce
Balk
writ
and
cour
form
conv
rang
olog
of th
with
in th
been
Russ
Stat
Slav
an a

even 8,000 and 9,000; yet he does not suggest that the problem of man-power was a factor in this reduction.

For an inquiring journalist "the Red Army is just as hard a wall to penetrate as the Communist Party, and that is saying a good deal." It was most difficult of all to learn anything about the new generals brought forward after the German advances in 1941 and 1942. Yet the author managed to learn something, and his brief chapter indicates how far-reaching was the "re-organization" of the High Command in the fall of 1942. "The darlings of the Kremlin," (the old heroes of the Civil War) were swept aside, and the fighting commands turned over to younger men who had learned the lessons of the present war.

T. H. THOMAS

Cambridge, Massachusetts

SUMNER, B. H. *A Short History of Russia*. New York, Reynal and Hitchcock, 1943. 469 pp. \$3.75.

ISWOLSKY, HELEN. *Soul of Russia*. New York, Sheed and Ward, 1943. 200 pp. \$2.75.

Mr. Sumner, the author of an excellent monograph on Russia's Balkan policy in the 1870's, has written an extremely interesting and stimulating survey of the whole course of Russian history. The form of this survey is rather unconventional. Mr. Sumner has arranged his material not in a chronological order but topically. Each of the seven parts of the book deals with one of the major forces which, in the opinion of the author, have been shaping the destinies of the Russian people: the Frontier, the State, the Land, the Church, the Slavs, the Sea and the West. Such an arrangement has obvious advantages.

It permits Mr. Sumner to follow each major trend throughout the whole extent of Russia's historical development, and in each case to make clear its continuity. But the method also has its disadvantages. Thus, some of the important material that could not be omitted apparently failed to find its proper place under one of the first six headings, with the result that the last part of the book had to shelter it to the detriment of its own unity. On the other hand, the constant interrelationship in history of the various factors which in this book have received a separate treatment has made it necessary for the author to use numerous cross-references, to the extent of making it somewhat uncomfortable for the reader. At least some of Mr. Sumner's readers can be slightly disconcerted still by another unconventional feature of his presentation: within each of the seven parts the discussion begins with the present situation and then goes into the historical background. Even the chronological chart appended to the book has been arranged in the reverse, which does not strike one as a particularly helpful procedure. On the whole, as an introduction to Russian history Mr. Sumner's book has its drawbacks. But to those who have some knowledge of Russia's past, the reading of this volume will be richly rewarding. Undoubtedly, it is one of the most valuable works on Russian history that appeared in English during the last two decades.

The author is at his best in discussing Russia's territorial expansion, social and economic developments, and, above all, foreign policy. In the part devoted to the Russian Church, he passes some summary judgments which to me do not sound too convincing, while in his

treatment of the history of the Russian state he becomes, I am afraid, a victim of his own method. Here his desire to stress historical continuity has led him to minimize the element of change. I, for one, find it difficult to agree that in the long period between 1500 and 1900 the "main characteristics of Tsarism" remained the same. Likewise, in my opinion, the constitutional reform of 1905-06 went further and had a more profound effect on Russian life than the author would make it appear.

Factual errors in Mr. Sumner's book are few, and in most cases not very important. For example: the word "Nihilist" was coined not by Turgenev (p. 310) but long before him by Nadezhdin; the Academy of Sciences was opened not in 1725 (p. 326) but in 1727; Milyukov was born not in 1870 (p. 359) but in 1859. One serious error is the figure given for the percentage of illiteracy in Russia in 1914: it was not over 75 per cent (p. 329) but less than 60 per cent (see N. S. Timashev's article, "Overcoming Illiteracy," in Vol. II, No. 1 of *The Russian Review*.)

In her attractively written little volume, Miss Iswolsky deals with one of Mr. Sumner's seven major trends—the Church, or rather the religious life within and outside the Church, which to her is a key to Russia's "spiritual history." She approaches her subject in a spirit different from that of Mr. Sumner who has not many kind words to say about the Russian Church. Neither is her book an "academic work," in any sense of the word. To quote her own admission, it is "a work of love more than a work of scholarship." The approach is a legitimate one, and to a large extent it has been justified by the result.

Because of the author's enthusiasm for her subject, she keeps her reader interested from the beginning to the end, while her sympathetic understanding has enabled her to give many phases of Russia's religious history a convincing interpretation.

Several chapters in the book deal with those of the Russian religious thinkers who were favoring reunion with Rome, and there is a special chapter on Russian Catholics. While these chapters have a considerable interest of their own, one might feel that the space they occupy in the present book is out of proportion with the importance of this particular trend in Russia's spiritual history. Miss Iswolsky treads on an even more debatable ground when she ventures into the field lying beyond the limits of religious history, properly speaking. Not all her readers will accept the thesis concerning the supposedly religious character of much of the Russian revolutionary movement (here she follows some other Russian writers on the subject). Likewise, a sceptic might wonder whether the survival of "collective responsibility" in the Russian village commune was not due more to the administrative and economic requirements of both the government and the squires than to the "evangelical character" of the *mir*. With all these reservations, however, Miss Iswolsky's book can be warmly recommended to all those interested in the fate of religion in Russia.

Unfortunately, the number of factual errors in questions of detail suggests a certain haste in the preparation of the manuscript. The old Russian *veche*, for instance, was not an *elected* body (p. 6). The name of Patriarch Nikon's collaborator

was
Ther
Grea
hand
into
(p. 9
eigh
Eliza
the E
did n
cann
vide
Baku
an i
(p. 9
nin
Com
simil
two
pen,
foun
Frer
one

Har

VER
sia
G
K
H
19

P
new
ume
are
brev
and
larg
Rus
acco
Chr
Prim
most
peri
datic
in th
The
temp

was Neronov, not Neverov (p. 48). There is no evidence that Peter the Great slayed his son "with his own hands" (p. 69). Freemasonry came into Russia not under Catherine II (p. 92), but in the middle of the eighteenth century, under Empress Elizabeth. One can agree that after the Emancipation the liberated serfs did not receive enough land, but one cannot say that they "were not provided with land" (p. 152). Finally, Bakunin and Wagner met during an insurrection not in Stuttgart (p. 98), but in Dresden, and Bakunin participated not in the Paris Commune (*ibid.*), but in a minor similar outbreak in Lyons. The last two errors are obvious slips of the pen, as the correct facts can be found, among other sources, in a French biography of Bakunin by one Helen Iswolsky.

MICHAEL KARPOVICH
Harvard University.

VERNADSKY, GEORGE. *Ancient Russia. (A History of Russia by George Vernadsky and Michael Karpovich. Volume 1.)* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1943. 425 pp. \$5.

Professor George Vernadsky's new book *Ancient Russia* is a volume of 370 pages of text to which are added 55 pages of lists of abbreviations, sources, chronology, and a general index. And this rather large volume brings the history of Russia only to 878-880 A.D., when, according to the Russian *Primary Chronicle*, "Oleg set himself up as Prince in Kiev." In other words, almost the entire book deals with the period preceding the so-called foundation of the Russian state in Kiev in the middle of the ninth century. The idea is not new. Similar attempts to deal with this earlier

period have been made before, beginning with V. N. Tatishchev's *Russian History* (volume I published in 1768), and coming down to recent Russian works, such as B. D. Grekov's *Kievan Russia* and volume I of the *History of the USSR*, compiled by several historians (both published in 1939). But, of course, Vernadsky, going back to the beginnings of the neolithic culture in Russia (about B.C. 3000), treats the question on a much larger scale and takes into account the results of many recent archaeological, epigraphic, numismatic, and historical studies. He pays attention not only to events within the geographic area of Russia itself, but likewise to developments in some neighboring countries, as for example the Balkan peninsula, the Byzantine Empire, the Khazar (Turkish) Kaganate, and the Arab Caliphate. According to his own statement, he approaches Russia's early background not from the point of view of the archaeologist or of the classical historian, but from that of an historian of Russia: he treats this background as an organic part of Russian history.

The book consists of eight chapters: I. Prehistory. II. The Cimmerian and Scythian Era, 1000-200 B.C. III. The Sarmato-Gothic Epoch, 200 B.C.-370 A.D. IV. The Hunno-Antic Period, A.D. 370-558. V. The Avaro-Antic Period, 558-650. VI. The Khazaro-Bulgar Period, 650-737. VII. The Norsemen and the Russian Khanate, 737-839. VIII. The Background of Kievan Russia, 839-878.

From this table of contents one realizes at once how vast and manifold is the subject treated by Vernadsky, and how open to criticism his presentation can be from various

points of view. In the first chapter on Prehistory, he depends entirely on literature dealing with the paleolithic era, the neolithic age, and the copper and bronze age; and as conclusions based on most such works are somewhat hypothetical, the author's presentation is also hypothetical. It gives us, however, an idea of what has lately been done in this field. He is on rather more solid ground in the second and third chapters, especially owing to the studies of E. H. Minns and M. I. Rostovtseff. The remaining chapters deal with various peoples whose history was connected with the territory of the future Russian state. Here the author shows a vast knowledge of both original sources and secondary works, criticizes them thoughtfully and presents a number of hypotheses of his own, some of them debatable.

One of the author's favorite problems, to which he has devoted much attention and several special studies, is that presented by the north Caucasian people of the Alans, the forefathers of the Ossetians, who were otherwise known as the As ("Asy or Iassy" of the Russian chronicles). Taking into account the fact that the name *Rus* or *Ros* had been used in South Russia long before the ninth century, when the Russian State was founded, Vernadsky pays special attention to one of the Alanic clans, that of the *Rukhs-As* (the Light As): he sees in the word *Rukhs* the origin of the Slavic *Rus* and Greek *Ros*, and calls this Alan clan the *Rus-As*. Proceeding from this hypothesis, he arrives at the conclusion that "not later than at the beginning of the ninth century the name must have been assumed by the Swedish warriors who established their control over the Don and Azov area; and

these Russianized Swedes became subsequently known as *Rus* both in Byzantium and in the Near and Middle East." (p. 278). In my opinion, Vernadsky has not succeeded in proving this hypothesis which, though stimulating, does not solve the old question of the origin of the name *Rus*, i.e. Russia.

On the other hand, I entirely agree with Vernadsky that the identification of the Russian prince Rurik of Novgorod with Rorik of Jutland of Western annals, suggested over a hundred years ago by F. Kruse and confirmed in 1929 by N. Belyaev, is certainly valid (p. 337).

In this review it is out of place to challenge minor details. In a book of this scope, covering many centuries and dealing with many problems, there inevitably will be many points over which disagreement is possible.

At the end of his book Vernadsky gives an ample bibliography. It does not include, however, the Russian article of V. A. Brim, "Origin of the term *Rus*" (*Rossiia i Zapad*, 1923, No. 13) nor the French book by Chr. Gerard *Les Bulgares de la Volga et les Slaves du Danube* (Paris, 1939). I would also like to add a new edition of Ibn-Fadhlān's famous report of his mission to the Volga Bulgars, prepared by a Turkish scholar, A. Zeki Validi Togan, and published under the title "Ibn-Fadhlān's Reisebericht," in the *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, XXIV, 3 (1939).

The present volume is the result of Vernadsky's studies extending over a period of many years and it is a highly interesting work. It does not matter that several of the author's hypotheses cannot be accepted without further investigations. His book will remain a very valuable addition to our knowledge of

Russian
torical

Madis

JAMES

Scie

Am

Ala.

Nor

1942

Stu

No.

CHEV

aska

The

Yor

320

The
valuab
of that
in the
mains
erican

Mr.

with

Bannis

entific

by two

Major

1862)

tin B

first e

nal, p

bibliog

six co

able i

James

the Jo

has ne

it was

daugh

Ken

nected

land

less ef

and R

The e

Russia's prehistory and earliest historical past.

A. VASILIEV

Madison, Wisconsin

JAMES, JAMES ALTON. *The First Scientific Exploration of Russian America and the Purchase of Alaska*. Evanston and Chicago, Northwestern University Press, 1942. (Northwestern University Studies in the Social Sciences, No. 4). 276 pp. \$2.50.

CHEVIGNY, HECTOR. *Lord of Alaska: The Story of Baranov and The Russian Adventure*. New York, The Viking Press. 1942. 320 pp. \$3.00.

These two books on Alaska are valuable contributions to the history of that land which, while very much in the limelight these days, still remains "terra incognita" to the American public at large.

Mr. James' work deals primarily with the so-called Kennicott and Bannister Journals—diaries of scientific observations made in Alaska by two energetic young Americans, Major Robert Kennicott (in 1859-1862) and Lieutenant Henry Martin Bannister (in 1865-66). The first edition of the Kennicott Journal, published in part in 1869, is a bibliographical rarity. Today only six copies of this volume are available in American libraries. Mr. James gives the complete text of the Journal. The Bannister Journal has never been published before, as it was discovered by the explorer's daughter only in 1939.

Kennicott's expedition was connected with the so-called "Overland Telegraph" project, a fruitless effort to link the United States and Russia via the Behring Straits. The expedition lasted three years

and covered Central British America and a part of Russian America. It resulted in a report which permitted Charles Sumner to deliver his famous three-hour speech in the Senate in favor of the ratification of the Alaska Purchase Treaty. In this oration, which was called a "monument of comprehensive research," Sumner spoke of the reliable information contributed by Kennicott and Bannister. Bannister, also connected with the "Overland Telegraph" project, was the only person then in Washington (Kennicott died at his Alaskan post in 1866) who could give a first hand account of conditions in Alaska, and it is known that both Sumner and Seward made extensive use of his information.

The author who convinces us that the honor or bringing about the acquisition of Alaska really belongs to these two Americans, deals also with the tremendous opposition which was encountered by Seward and other members of the Cabinet. The "Sucked Orange of the Tsar," the "Inexhaustible Ice Fields," the "Polar Bear Gardens," and the "Seward's Ice Box" were but a few of the catch-words of the day. In contrast with this prevailing idea of Alaska, Kennicott and Bannister reported that in Sitka, potatoes, radishes, cabbage, cauliflower, peas, and oats grew in abundance; even Kentucky blue grass could be found as far north as Oonalaaska. They pointed out that the mean temperature of Alaska winter was $32^{\circ}30'$ and of the summer $53^{\circ}37'$, or only 6° below Washington's winter and 20° below Washington's summer. But the reports dealt not only with the country's mild climate, its vegetables, and flowers. Definite observations were made also on the presence of gold and coal, and the gen-

eral mineral and fur wealth of Alaska.

In addition to the text of the Journals, we find in the book well documented and well written chapters on the project of the "Overland Telegraph" and on the Alaska Purchase Treaty itself.

It is regrettable that the author did not make use of the latest Russian work on the subject—S. B. Okun's *The Russian-American Company*, published in Moscow in 1939 (reviewed in *The Russian Review*, Vol. I, No. 2). The addition of new documentary material from Okun's work would have made this excellent book even more valuable to the American readers.

Mr. Chevigny's book is his second venture in the field of Russian-American history. The first dealt with Nikolai Rezanov, a Russian empire builder and adventurer whose name became associated with the early history of California. The present volume is a fascinating and well-written biography of Baranov, another empire builder, and the first official administrator of Russian America in its early days. Baranov, son of a provincial shopkeeper, but with a vision of a statesman, became not only a trader but also a warrior, a governor, a diplomat, a shipbuilder, and a son-in-law of an Indian chieftain. His colorful life, his struggles, his achievements, his dismissal, and his death in Batavia on his way home, are told by the author in a striking fashion.

It is a pity, however, that the proofreader has done such a slipshod job. The mistakes in the phonetic transcription of Russian words and names are too numerous to be cited. It is enough to say that not *one* item is correct in the annexed list of Russian sources. Incident-

ally, even Professor Robert J. Kerner suffers likewise, being listed under the name of Turner. The text itself fares no better: Suvorov, Lazarev, Panafidin, become Suvarov, Lozarev, Panifidin. Baranov's place of birth is given as Rylsk, "Ukraina," while in reality Rylsk is in the Kursk province, i.e. in Central Russia. There are some other mistakes of a similar and even more serious nature, and one is moved to say that in these days of "One World" such errors can no longer be considered inevitable.

ALEXANDER TARSAIDZE
New York City.

COURNOS, JOHN. (ed.) *A Treasury of Russian Life and Humor*. New York, Coward McCann, 1943. 676 pp. \$3.75.

YARMOLINSKY, AVRAHM. (ed.) *A Treasury of Great Russian Short Stories*. New York, Macmillan, 1944. 1018 pp. \$4.00.

GUERNEY, BERNARD G. (ed.) *A Treasury of Russian Literature*. New York, Vanguard Press, 1943. 1049 pp. \$3.95.

English translations of Russian classics, though plentiful, are not easily available today. Only a few American libraries possess adequate collections of Russian literature in English translations. Moreover, many of the better translations are today out of print and are disappearing from the market at the very time when the demand is constantly increasing. Anthologies, therefore, with all their inherent shortcomings, are indispensable guides for Anglo-Saxon readers who wish to acquaint themselves with Russian belles lettres.

Since Leo Wiener's two-volume anthology (Putnam, 1902), now out

of pri
at a
Russi
With
respon
in eve
of an
The
here
mater
tions
the th
sive
from
Mr.
sian
a cent
poetry
kin to
antho
the m
aspir
which
speci
In
phasi
chara
litera
sian
natur
ophil
indiv
Tolst
humo
Th
has t
mous
kin
from
Gian
Turg
Quix
End
the
and
some
aspir
tury
Le
"Cor

of print and out of date, no attempt at a comprehensive anthology of Russian literature has been made. Within the last year, however, in response to a wide-spread interest in everything Russian, a new crop of anthologies has appeared.

The three anthologies reviewed here differ considerably in scope, material, in the quality of translations and editorial work. Together, the three offer a fairly comprehensive picture of Russian literature from its beginning to the present.

Mr. Cournos' *A Treasury of Russian Life and Humor* covers about a century of Russian fiction, drama, poetry, autobiography (from Pushkin to present day authors). This anthology is supposed "to elucidate the nature of Russian genius and aspirations," and to illustrate that which gives Russian literature "its specially Russian quality."

In his introduction, the editor emphasizes especially the following characteristics of Russian life and literature: "universality of the Russian spirit"; "duality of Russian nature," (in philosophy—the Slavophiles and the Westerners, and individual conflicts in authors like Tolstoy, Gogol, and Dostoevsky); humor or comic spirit.

The section "Russia's Mission" has the whole of Dostoevsky's famous memorial speech on Pushkin (June 8, 1880); selections from Merezhkovsky's essay "The Giants of Russian Literature;" Turgenev's lecture "Hamlet and Quixote"; Berdyaev's book *The End of Our Time*. This section is the most useful part of the book and comes closest to illustrating some of the characteristic ideas and aspirations of the nineteenth century Russian thought.

Less fortunate is the section "Confessional, Biographical, Epis-

tolary," containing short selections from diaries and letters of pre-revolutionary authors on such disconnected topics as religion, inner conflicts, serfdom, Slav unity, Slavophilism. Disconcertingly brief—some excerpts are only a few lines long—these selections are apt to confuse the reader rather than enlighten him.

Some two hundred pages are devoted to shorter prose works from Pushkin to recent Soviet writers. Here it is difficult to see what exactly determined Mr. Cournos' choice. Many of the selections are again too brief, some appear to be taken from immature, and not very representative works (those especially from Turgenev, Andreev, Dostoevsky and some of the Soviet writers). Most unfortunate is the mixup in pagination resulting in the merger of Pushkin's "The Queen of Spades" with Gogol's "The Cloak," (pp. 164 and 197) and of Tolstoy's "God Sees the Truth, But Waits" with parts of Gogol's "The Cloak" (pp. 228 and 197).

Well chosen are the selections in "Wit, Humor and Satire" (Gogol, Krylov, Griboyedov, Ostrovsky, Goncharov, Zostchenko, etc.) and in the section called "The Cossacks" (Gogol's *Taras Bulba*, Tolstoy's *The Cossacks*, and Sholokhov's *The Silent Don*). To this reviewer, it is not clear, however, why a separate section in this anthology should be devoted to the Cossacks. Why not include the Gypsies or the Kal-mucks?

"Poetry" is undoubtedly the least fortunate part of the book. Most of the Russian poets, especially the modern ones, are inadequately represented; the translations are poor—better versions exist for most of the poems given. It is to be regretted that the editor failed to make

use of some of the translations of Russian poets by N. Jarintzova, Max Eastman, and V. Nabokov. All in all, Mr. Cournos' anthology, helpful in parts, seems to be a hastily put together hodge-podge of Russian literature.

Less ambitious in scope than Mr. Cournos' anthology but sounder and better organized is Mr. Yarmolinsky's *A Treasury of Great Russian Short Stories*. The volume is an omnibus of the shorter works of the pre-revolutionary writers. It begins with Pushkin and ends with Gorky. Through these selections the editor hopes to reveal the peculiar qualities of the respective writers and also to throw light on life in pre-revolutionary Russia. The volume contains an informative introductory essay with some biographical notes on the authors. Every piece included in this volume was made, as far as possible, complete in itself.

Russian fiction, says the editor, is to be read primarily for its warm humanity and penetrating insights into character. He points out, justly enough, that the idealization of the peasantry is a subject around which much of the Russian writing revolves: "The populist theme, assuming in turn a mystic, a positivist, a political guise, runs like a crimson thread through the texture of Russian literature." Many of the selections in this volume are excellent illustrations of this thread.

Most of the Russian short story writers are well and judiciously represented. One might wish that Pushkin's "romantic" side had been represented by "Dubrovsky" or by a selection from "The Captain's Daughter;" that some of Gogol's Ukrainian stories from *The Evenings On a Farm Near Dikanka* had been included; that Dostoev-

sky's late works had been represented, for example, by selections from *An Author's Diary* (1873-1881). But there can be no final judgment on such matters; what is incomprehensible is the total omission of Lermontov's prose. This great poet's collection of five short stories — *A Hero of Our Time* (1840) is Russian realistic prose at its best and contains immortal characters which are spiritually connected to heroes of Pushkin, Tolstoy, Turgenev. On the other hand, too much space has been given to stories of Chekhov (332 p.). Many of these are already well known, while a few lesser known stories could have easily been omitted. The translations throughout this volume represent the better versions available.

Bernard Guernsey's *A Treasury of Russian Literature* is the most ambitious anthology to appear since Leo Wiener's some forty years ago. Beginning with Nestor's Chronicle (XI c.) and ending with the works of Bunin and Merezhkovsky, just prior to the Bolshevik Revolution, the volume includes a complete, unabridged text of Dostoevsky's *Notes from the Underground*, Turgenev's novel, *Fathers and Sons*; full length plays: Gogol's *The Inspector General*, Chekhov's *The Three Sisters*, Gorky's *The Lowest Depth*. Many translations are new or revised. The volume includes a brief but spirited introduction by the editor and very helpful biographical and critical sketches preceding the selections.

"No other literature," says the editor in the introduction, "has been so misunderstood (with the best intentions in the world), so misinterpreted, and (at least in English) so mistranslated. It is richer in picaresque than even the Spanish; no other is richer in fable, satire, sheer

humor—and no other has so undeserved a reputation for gloom and morbidity." Mr. Guernsey's anthology goes a long way toward dispelling many such misunderstandings.

In addition to *The Lay of the Host of Igor*, the early Kievan period is mainly represented by a selection from Nestor's Chronicle, and by two of the heroic tales (*byliny*). It is perhaps to be regretted that no examples of religious and polemical literature of the Muscovite period were included.

The bulk of the book is naturally devoted to the great nineteenth century classics, poets, and prose writers. One is grateful to the editor for the inclusion of Krylov's fables in Sir Bernard Pares' excellent verse translations; Leskov's "Lady of Mtsensk;" the humorists Averchenko and Zoschenko; the symbolists Bryusov (*The Republic of the Southern Cross*) and Blok ("The Twelve"). Regrettable are the omissions of Goncharov, Ostrovsky, Bely, and some of the better known Soviet writers. But then, had these been represented the anthology would have expanded into another volume. As it is, the editor was certainly right in trying to avoid what he called "snippets and extracts."

The section on poetry is, on the whole, disappointing. The selections from Russia's great poets are too few, too fragmentary, and are not always in the best available translations. Unfortunate, too, is the rather chaotic transliteration of Russian names; especially irritating in this respect is the transliteration of the Russian *k* by the English *c*.

With all its minor shortcomings, Mr. Guernsey's anthology does offer a more complete and varied picture of Russian belles lettres than has appeared heretofore.

While the three anthologies reviewed here will help the study and appreciation of Russian literature, serious gaps remain still to be filled. We still lack adequate English translations of the Russian poets, and some of the Russian religious thinkers and political writers await translation. Let us hope that some future anthology will help to fill some of these gaps.

DIMITRI VON MOHRENSCHILDT
Dartmouth College.

KAUN, ALEXANDER and SIMMONS, ERNEST J., editors. *Slavic Studies: Sixteen Essays in Honor of George Rapall Noyes*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1943. 242 pp. \$3.00.

The friends of Professor Noyes who have joined to pay tribute to him in this volume have succeeded in reflecting that distinguished scholar's wide range of interests and accomplishments in a book of permanent value for Slavic students. Before so rich a collection of essays the reviewer must content himself with providing a simple indication of what is to be found among them, in the certainty that here is something for every taste.

Russian studies have the largest representation, and Lermontov receives the most attention among Russian writers. Alexander Kaun's study of the "poet of nostalgia," by its sensitive treatment of the persistent themes in Lermontov's verse, brings out that special and curious unity that is perhaps the most important single feature of the poet's lyric production. Henry Lanz places the *Demon* in the Promethean cycle of European literature and adds some very suggestive reflections on the closely related Manichaean heresy and its function in

the development of our civilization. Dorothea Prall Radin's translation of *Pesnya pro Tsarya Ivana Vasilyevicha* will undoubtedly become our standard one. Although the original verse form is not particularly rewarding in English (I do not suggest that a better one might have been chosen), Mrs. Radin maintains the high level of workmanship that puts all her translations in the very first class.

It is particularly fitting that, in a book dedicated to a great teacher, a large amount of the material should hold as much interest for the non-specialist as for the Slavist. Clarence Manning's study of time in the Russian novel, for example, is a stimulating lesson in the application of careful scholarship to problems of literary criticism. Starting from the contradictions in the chronology of *Rudin*, the author is able to make clear some of the most distinctive features of the Russian novel between Gogol and the Neo-Romantics. It is to be hoped that he will give us further studies of this rewarding problem. With equal effect J. A. Posin compares Belinsky's criticism of Pushkin and *Eugene Onegin* with Pisarev's to illustrate the differences—and the underlying agreement—between the two critics and their epochs. George Patrick treats the relative independence of Ostrovsky in the quarrels of the Slavophiles and Westerners, and Nikander Strelnsky continues his investigations of Saltykov with a new and convincing interpretation of the sixth chapter of *Bygone Days in Poshekhonye*. Ernest Simmons' contribution on the writing of *War and Peace* will whet the readers's appetite for his forthcoming biography of Tolstoy.

It is interesting to note that the two essays concerned with Polish

culture treat their subject in relation to Russia. In fact, Wacław Lednicki's charming and avowedly experimental article on Mickiewicz, Dostoevsky, and Blok is first of all a study of the Polish scar on the Russian conscience. Arthur Coleman writes of the maturing effect of the South Russian journey on Mickiewicz's work and illustrates his thesis with many of his own excellent translations.

Czech studies are represented by René Wellek's article on "the two traditions of Czech literature," in which sympathetic attention is directed to comparatively neglected periods of Czech literary development. The essay is written with a sure hand and includes an amazingly large amount of both information and interpretation in a small space. Alfred Senn contributes some notes on Lithuanian religious practices which are interesting both for their intrinsic value and for the light they cast on the cultural history of Lithuania.

Oliver Elton, with a graceful translation from Mileta Jaksic, and Sir Bernard Pares, with an affectionate foreword to the volume, pay Britain's tribute. A biographical sketch and a bibliography of Professor Noyes' writings, prepared by Oleg Maslenikov with the aid of Mrs. Behrens, make an appropriate conclusion to the volume. The reader will be grateful also for the frontispiece portrait by Valeria Kaun.

To many the most precious pages in this book will be those two containing the concise, sober, and generous appreciation of Professor Noyes' work, contributed by another distinguished leader of Slavic studies in this country, the late Samuel N. Harper.

F. J. WHITFIELD
The Society of Fellows,
Harvard University.

DUG
La
19
Dr
often
give
pene
situa
traye
of th
the d
be th
mank
Th
sourc
work
figur
servic
ed int
in the
perio
Bryce
stein,
zon,
estim
with
minds
exalt
here
shrive
The
himse
ponde
of ex
the d
acute,
sincer
quite
per. S
piditie
of the
spots
twenty
perien
troop
ed Igo
to a n
Dr.
ocrat

DUGGAN, STEPHEN. *A Professor at Large*. New York, Macmillan, 1943. 468 pp. \$3.50.

Dr. Duggan has been "at large" often enough and long enough to give his judgments the qualities of penetration and of maturity. The situations understandingly portrayed in his book extend over most of those areas of the world where the decisions will be taken that will be the better or the worse for all mankind.

The book reflects the wealth of source material found in personal working relations with first rate figures along the paths of duty and service. Many of the contacts ripened into friendships. The roster takes in the American Presidents of the period, Charles E. Hughes, Lord Bryce, Painlevé, Mme. Curie, Einstein, Masaryk, Schacht, Bose, Quezon, to cite but a few. Pen sketch estimates of the topline figures met with will delight the biographically minded. Not all of the appraisals exalt the subjects. Let the curtain here fall on the cases blasted and shrivelled.

The author successfully saves himself from being profound or ponderous. His style is rather that of exchanges at the club or across the dinner table between mentally acute, intelligently informed, and sincere persons. Frankness, at times quite startling, is a prevailing temper. Sharp thrusts are made at stupidities and evils. The good humor of the educator exudes in such tight spots as at the Chinese feast of twenty-three courses, the initial experience with vodka, a salamander troop in the bedroom, and G-stringed Igorrote waiters serving dinner to a mixed company of educators.

Dr. Duggan is an incurable democrat in every situation, upholding

his faith without a trace of the demagoguery that is nauseating in the current wartime propaganda. He keeps realistic equilibrium in recognizing shortcomings in the pursuit of our professed way of life while valiantly defending our fundamental institutions and exalting the excellencies in the national culture. He is one who believes we have cultural values for export and does not hesitate to proffer them.

The early chapters give in print for the first time the origin, objectives, and operations of the Institute of International Education. Dr. Duggan is its founder and director.

Many organizations some more popularly known, are debtors to the vision, wisdom, and energy of the Institute's chief executive and his associates. Off hand, these beneficiaries may be named: The Council on Foreign Relations, Foreign Policy Association, Pan-American Union, Institute of Pacific Relations, Philippine Educational Commission, Russian Student Fund, and the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars.

Especially interesting, in this connection, is the story of the Russian Student Fund—a revolving fund founded in 1921 by Alexis Wiren with the assistance of the Institute of International Education. This splendid organization enabled some 600 young Russians to complete their higher education in this country. Today a high percentage of these men are serving in various specialized capacities in the armed forces of their adopted country. Thus, along with accounting for the genius, growth, and services of the Institute, the professor at large presents in brief a compendium of other essential agencies

to which humanity will owe much if and when the goal is reached of a world insured of peace.

Golden threads of consistency run through the whole story and give it unity. The principles and methods of the educator are ever invoked. There is fidelity to the credo of "economic security with freedom for the individual" with-

out respect to race, color, or religion. The myth of white supremacy gets rough handling. "The essential meaning of life" the author finds to be "in the ideas that unite men and not in those that divide them."

E. T. COLTON

New York City.

Aldar
Tra
Yo
Basse
Ari
of
Tra
Yo
\$2.
Berez
Ni
Lip
Boro
Lon
-Th
Hu
Bow
Syn
lan
cha
-(ed
Lon
6d.
Brow
For
Ne
\$2.
Cassie
line
ton
Cham
Ru.

Bibliography

Books and Articles on Russia Published in 1943

By NIKANDER AND KATHERINE STRELSKY

I. BOOKS

- Aldanov, Mark. *The Fifth Seal*. Transl. Nicholas Wreden. New York, Scribner. 482 pp. \$3.00.
- Basseches, Nikolaus. *The Unknown Army: The Nature and History of the Russian Military Forces*. Transl. Marion Saerchinger. New York, Viking Press. 239 pp. \$2.50.
- Berezowsky, Alice. *Duet with Nicky*. Philadelphia-New York, Lippincott, 239 pp. \$2.75.
- Borodin, George. *Soviet Siberia*. London, Hutchinson, 168 pp. 15s.
- *This Russian Land*. London, Hutchinson. 184 pp. 8s. 6d.
- Bowra, C. M. *The Heritage of Symbolism*. New York, Macmillan. 232 pp. 3.75. (Includes a chapter on Alexander Blok).
- (ed). *A Book of Russian Verse*. London, Macmillan. 127 pp. 8s. 6d.
- Brown, James E. *Russia Fights*. Foreword by Joseph E. Davies. New York, Scribner. 276 pp. \$2.50.
- Cassidy, Henry C. *Moscow Date-line, 1941-1943*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin. 375 pp. \$3.00.
- Chamberlin, William Henry. *The Russian Enigma: An Interpretation*. New York, Scribner. 321 pp. \$2.75.
- Childs, John L., Counts, George S. *America, Russia, and the Communist Party in the Post-War World*. New York, Day. 92 pp. \$1.25.
- Cole, David M. *The Red Army*. London, Rich and Cowan. 156 pp. 10s. 6d.
- Cole, Margaret (ed). *Our Soviet Ally*. Essays by Margaret Cole, Dr. N. Barou, I. Narodny, A. Steinberg. Fabian Society. London, Routledge. 194 pp. 7s. 6d.
- Counts, George S. See Childs, John L.
- Cournos, John (ed.) *Treasury of Russian Life and Humor*. New York, Coward-McCann. 676 pp. \$3.75.
- Curie, Eve. *Journey Among Warriors*. Garden City (N. Y.), Doubleday-Doran. 501 pp. \$3.00 (Includes a part on the Soviet Union at war).
- Dallin, David J. *Russia and Post-war Europe*. Transl. F. K. Lawrence. New Haven, Yale University Press, 230 pp. \$2.75.
- Dana, H. W. L. *Drama in Wartime Russia*. New York, National

- Council of American - Soviet Friendship. 48 pp. \$0.15.
- Dobb, Maurice. *The U.S.S.R.: Her Life and Her People*. London, University of London Press. 139 pp. 4s. 6d.
- Ehrenburg, Ilya. *Russia at War*. Transl. Gerard Schelley. Intro. by J. B. Priestley. London, Hamish Hamilton. 277 pp. 10s. 6d.
- Fisher, Raymond H. *The Russian Fur Trade, 1550-1700*. (University of California Publications in History, vol. 31). Berkeley, University of California Press. 275 pp. \$3.00.
- Galli-Shohat, Nadejda. See Seroff, Victor I.
- Goodall, George (ed.) *Soviet Russia in Maps: Its Origins and Development*. Chicago-New York, Denoyer. 32 pp. \$1.00.
- Graebner, Walter. *Round Trip to Russia*. Philadelphia-New York, Lippincott. 216 pp. \$3.00.
- Grierson, Philip. *Books on Soviet Russia, 1917-1942: A Bibliography and a Guide to Reading*. London, Methuen. 354 pp. 12s. 6d.
- Grossman, Vassily. *The People Immortal: A Novel of the Red Army in Action*. London, Hutchinson. 120 pp. 7s. 6d.
- Guerney, Bernard Guilbert (ed.) *A Treasury of Russian Literature*. New York, The Vanguard Press. 1048 pp. \$3.95.
- Hindus, Maurice. *Mother Russia*. New York, Doubleday-Doran. 395 pp. \$3.00.
- Howard, Alexander; Neumann, Ernest. *Pictorial History of Russia from Rurik to Stalin: One Thousand Years of Russian History in Pictures*. London, Hutchinson. 216 pp. 16s.
- *Ten Men Who Made Russia: Pictorial History*. London, Alliance. 80 pp. 3s. 6d.
- Hubbard, Leonard E. *Soviet Labor and Industry*. New York, Macmillan. 314 pp. \$3.25.
- Izwolsky, Helen. *The Soul of Russia*. New York, Sheed and Ward. 200 pp. \$2.75.
- Ives, Vernon. *Russia*. Ill. Raffaello Busoni. Land and Peoples Series. New York, Holiday House. 25 pp. \$1.00.
- Johnson, Hewlett. *The Secret of Soviet Strength*. New York, International Publishers. 160 pp. \$1.50.
- Kaun, Alexander. *Soviet Poets and Poetry*. Berkeley, University of California Press. 208 pp. \$2.50.
- Kaun, Alexander; Simmons, Ernest J. (eds.) *Slavic Studies*. Ithaca (N. Y.) Cornell University Press. 242 pp. \$3.00. (Sixteen essays in honor of George Rapall Noyes).
- Kerner, Robert J. (ed.) *The U.S.S.R. Economy and the War*. New York, Russian Economic Institute. 110 pp. \$1.50.
- Kornilov, Alexander. *Modern Russian History from the Age of Catherine the Great to the End of the Nineteenth Century*. Transl. A. S. Kaun. Rev. ed. with new bibliography by John S. Curtiss. New York, Knopf. 594 pp. \$4.50.
- Lantzeff, George V. *Siberia in the Seventeenth Century: A Study of the Colonial Administration*. (University of California Publications in History, vol. 30). Berkeley (California), University of California Press. 235 pp. \$2.75.
- Lavrin, Janko. *Dostoevsky: A Study*. London, Methuen. 158 pp. 7s. 6d.
- Lengyel, Emil. *Siberia*. New York, Random House. 416 pp. \$3.75.
- Lesueur, Larry. *Twelve Months That Changed the World*. New York, Knopf. 345 pp. \$3.00.

- Levitats, Isaac. *The Jewish Community in Russia, 1772-1844*. New York, Columbia University Press. 300 pp. \$3.50.
- Lied, Jonas. *Return to Happiness*. London, Macmillan. 318 pp. 18s. (Experiences in pre-revolutionary Siberia and in Soviet Russia).
- Lloyd, J. A. T. *Ivan Turgenev: A Biography*. London, Hale. 227 pp. 12s 6d. (New York, Transatlantic. \$3.75.).
- Macleod, Joseph. *The New Soviet Theatre*. London, Allen and Unwin. 242 pp. 12s. 6d.
- Marks, Stanley J. *The Bear That Walks Like a Man: A Diplomatic and Military Analysis of Soviet Russia*. Philadelphia, Dorrance. 340 pp. \$3.00.
- Meiksins, Gregory. *The Baltic Riddle*. New York, Fischer. 271 pp. \$3.00.
- Millner, Ralph. *Soviet Justice*. Intro. by D. N. Pritt. London, Allen. 64 pp. 1s. 6d.
- Moats, Alice-Leone. *Blind Date With Mars*. New York, Doubleday-Doran. 486 pp. \$3.00.
- Murphy, John T. *Manual of Soviet Enterprise*. London, Crowther. 48 pp. 1s. 6d.
- Newmann, Ernest — See above: Howard, Alexander.
- Pares, Bernard. *Russia*. New York, Penguin Books. 245 pp. \$0.25. (New revised edition).
- Poliakov, Alexander. *White Mammoths: The Dramatic Story of Russian Tanks in Action*. Transl. Norbert Guterman. New York, Dutton. 189 pp. \$2.50.
- Pope, Arthur Upham. *Maxim Litvinov*. New York, Fischer. 530 pp. \$3.50.
- Price, M. Philips. *Russia Through the Centuries: The Historical Background of the U.S.S.R.* London, Allan and Unwin. 136 pp. 5s.
- Sava, George. *Russia Triumphant*. London, Faber. 216 pp. 15s.
- Seroff, Victor I.; Galli-Shohat, Nadejda. *Dmitri Shostakovich: The Life and Background of a Soviet Composer*. New York, Knopf. 260 pp. \$3.00.
- Sevastopol, November 1941—July, 1942. London, Hutchinson. 76 pp. 2s. 6d.
- Simmons, Ernest J. *An Outline of Modern Russian Literature (1880-1940)*. Ithaca (N. Y.), Cornell University Press. 93 pp. \$1.00.
- See above: Kaun, Alexander.
- Simonov, Konstantin. *No Quarter*. New York, Fischer. 231 pp. \$2.75.
- Spector, Ivar. *The Golden Age of Russian Literature*. Caldwell (Idaho), The Caxton Printers. 258 pp. \$3.50.
- Stalin, Joseph. *The War of National Liberation*. Book II. New York, International Publishers. 64 pp. \$0.75.
- Stewart, Maxwell S. (ed.) *Our Neighbors Across the Pacific*. St. Louis, Webster Publishing Co. 491 pp. \$1.68. (Includes "Land of the Soviets" by Marguerite Anne Stewart).
- Strong, Anna Louise. *The Russians Are People*. London, Cobbett. 202 pp. 3s. 6d.
- Sumner, Benedict H. *A Short History of Russia*. New York, Reynal and Hitchcock. 469 pp. \$3.75.
- Van Doren, Mark (ed.) *The Night of the Summer Solstice and Other Stories of the Russian War*. New York, Holt. 245 pp. \$2.50.
- Van Gyseghem, André. *Theatre in Soviet Russia*. London, Faber. 220 pp. 12s. 6d.

- Vernadsky, George. *Ancient Russia* (Vol. I of *A History of Russia*, by George Vernadsky and Michael Karpovich). New Haven, Yale University Press. 425 pp. \$5.00.
- Voyetekhov, Boris. *The Last Days of Sevastopol*. Transl. Ralph Parker. New York, Knopf. 225 pp. \$2.50.
- Weinstock, Herbert. *Tschaikovsky*. New York, Knopf. 386 pp. \$5.00.
- Williams, Albert Rhys. *The Russians: The Land, the People, and Why They Fight*. New York, Harcourt-Brace. 248 pp. \$2.00.
- Yarmolinsky, Avrahm. *Russian Americana, 16th to 18th Centuries: A Bibliographical and Historical Study*. New York, The New York Public Library, 45 pp. \$0.90.
- Yaroslavsky, Emelian. *Twenty-Five Years of Soviet Power*. London-Hutchinson. 80 pp. 1s.

II. ARTICLES

- Adey, Alvin. "For Better Relations with Russia." *Current History*, IV: 106-109.
- Alexandrova, Vera. "America and Americans in Soviet Literature." *Russian Review*, II: 2: 19-26.
- "New Concepts of Ivan the Terrible." *Books Abroad*, XVII: 318-324.
- "Russia Is Changing: Wartime Poetry, Novels, and Plays Provide Proof." *American Mercury*, LVI: 311-318.
- Anderson, H. Foster. "Russia and Europe." *Fortnightly Review*, CLI: 217-224.
- "Soviet-Polish Relations." *Fortnightly Review*, CLIII: 294-299.
- Barghoorn, Frederick Charles. "Russian Radicals of the 1860's and the Problem of the Industrial Proletariat." *Slavonic and East European Review*, (Am. series 2), XXI: 57-69.
- Beardsley, Monroe C. "Berdyayev: Sybil in Waste Land." *Russian Review*, II: 2: 10-18.
- Beazley, Raymond. "Russia and the Far East." *Contemporary Review*, CLXIII: 81-86.
- "Russia In Central Asia." *Contemporary Review*, CLXIII: 279-284.
- Beloff, Max. "The Future of an Alliance: Anglo-Soviet Cooperation in the Coming Peace." *Political Quarterly*, XIV: 185-196.
- Berman, Nathan. "The Place of the Child in Present Day Russia." *Social Forces*, XXI: 446-456.
- Bernshtam, A. N. "Kirghizia." *American Journal of Archaeology*, XLVII: 245-247.
- Boelza, Igor. "Communication from Moscow." (Music published and awaiting publication in the U.S. S.R.) *Musical Quarterly*, XXIX: 266-268.
- Brash, W. B. "Tolstoy's War and Peace." *London Quarterly Review*, CLXVIII: 122-130.
- Burnitskaya, P. M. "Children's Books in Wartime Russia." Activities of the Young Readers' Publishing House, Moscow. *Horn Book*, XIX: 85-89.
- Carmichael, Joel. "Soviet Policy and the German Machines." *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XLII: 252-261.
- Chamberlin, William Henry. "The Sources of Russia's Strength." *Harper*, CLXXXVI: 396-403.
- "American - Russian Cooperation." *Russian Review*, III: 1: 3-9.

- "Russia's Rôle in the Postwar World." *Russian Review*, II: 2: 3-9.
- Cohen, Theodore. "Wartime Profits of Russian Industry, 1914-1916." (Bibliography and tables.) *Political Science Quarterly*, LVIII: 217-238.
- Conolly, Violet. "Soviet Russia Today." *Asiatic Review*, XXXIX: 89-93.
- Cross, Samuel H. "Russian Literature since 1918." *The Harvard Advocate*, CXXIX: 4.
- Dallin, David J. "Inside the Red Army." *Russian Review*, III: 1: 23-30.
- "Russia's Aim in Europe." *American Mercury*, LVII: 391-402.
- Dana, H. W. L. "Twenty-five Years of Soviet Drama." *The Harvard Advocate*, CXXIX: 4.
- Dangerfield, Elma. "Deportees; Polish and Baltic Deportees in Russia." *Nineteenth Century and After*, CXXXIV: 19-29.
- Dean, Vera Micheles. "The U.S. S.R. and Postwar Europe." *Foreign Policy Reports*, XIX: 122-139.
- "Development of Soviet Foreign Policy in Europe, 1917-1942, *International Conciliation*. CCCLXXXIV: 42-86.
- Dorpale, Andreas. "Britain and Russia: Anglo-Russian alliance, 1942." *Virginia Quarterly Review*, XIX: 498-512.
- Eastman, Max. "We Must Face the Facts About Russia." *Reader's Digest*, XLIII: 255.
- Engel, Leonard. "Red Officer Corps." *Infantry Journal*, LII: 18-24.
- Fay, Sidney Bradshaw. "Russia's Western Border Lands." *Current History*, IV: 289-300.
- "What about Postwar Germany? Russia's Intentions." *Current History*, IV: 98-99.
- Fedotov, G. P. "The Religious Background of Russian Culture." *Church History*, XII: 35-51.
- "Some Problems in the Study of Ancient Russian Literature." Summary. *Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences*, I: 534-538.
- "Fortune Survey: Hand Is Out to Russia." Tables. *Fortune*, XXVII: 22 ff.
- Frederiksen, O. J. "Alexander I and His League to End Wars." *Russian Review*, III: 1: 10-22.
- "Virginia Tobacco in Russia under Peter the Great." *Slavonic and East European Review* (Am. series 2), XXI: 40-56.
- Frenz, Horst. "Eugene O'Neill in Russia." *Poet Lore*, XLIX: 242-247.
- Fyodorov, Colonel. "Twenty-five Years of the Red Army." *Anglo-Soviet Journal*, IV: 84-100.
- Gillis, J. M. "No Alliance with Atheism." *Catholic World*, CLIV: 390-395.
- Gilmore, Eddy. "I Learn about the Russians." *National Geographic Magazine*, LXXXIV: 619-140.
- Glasgow, George. "Russian Colossus." *Contemporary Review*, CLXIV: 182-188.
- Gooch, George Peabody. "Courts and Cabinets: Caulaincourt, Napoleon and Alexander." *Contemporary Review*, CLXIV: 283-293: 342-348.
- "Government by Horse Sense: Selling the People on Russia." *Fortune*, XXVII: 128ff.
- Grajdanzev, Andrew Jonah. "Soviet Public Finances on the Eve of the War." *Slavonic and East European Review* (Am. series 2), XXI: 89-95.
- Grekov, B. D., and Tarlé, Eugene V. "Soviet Historical Research." *Science and Society*, VII: 3: 217-232.

- Gruenwald, Bruno. "The Soviet Black Sea Fleet." *Soviet Russia Today*, March, pp. 22-23.
- Guins, G. C. "Russians in Manchuria." *Russian Review*, III: I: 81-87.
- Gurian, Waldemar. "The Memoirs of Bely." *Russian Review*, III: 1: 95-103.
- "Foreign Policy of Soviet Russia." *Review of Politics*, V: 177-193.
- Gwynn, Charles. "The Russian Situation in Retrospect." *Fortnightly Review*, CLIV: 183-186.
- "The Kursk Offensive." *Fortnightly Review*, CLIII: 113-116.
- "The Dnieper Battles." *Fortnightly Review*, CLIV: 397-400.
- "Marshall Zhukov's Offensive." *Fortnightly Review*, CLIII: 111-114.
- "Marshal Zhukov's Offensive Continues." *Fortnightly Review*, CLIII: 185-188.
- Halecki, Oskar. "Polish-Russian Relations — Past and Present." *Review of Politics*, V: 322-338.
- Hall, Donovan. "The Riches of the Siberian Taiga." *Travel*, LXXX: 22-25.
- Halle, Fannina W. "Free Women of Russia." *Women's Home Companion*, LXX: 30-31.
- Hamilton, Alice. "Exploring the Dangerous Trades." (Industrial medicine in the U.S.S.R.) *Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXI: 136-145.
- Hazard, John N. "The Soviet Constitution: An Introduction." *Lawyers Guild Review*, III: 6.
- Hill, Elizabeth. "Russia, the U.S. S.R., and Asia." *Royal Central Asian Society Journal*, XXX: 71-80.
- Hindus, Maurice G. "The Price That Russia Is Paying." *Reader's Digest*, XLII: 47-50.
- "Why the Russians Will Never Quit." *American Magazine*, CX: XXV: 35ff.
- "The Meaning of Russia's Nationalism." *Asia*, XLIII: 517-519.
- Hoseh, M. "Recent Russian Literature on Natural and Synthetic Rubber." *India Rubber World*, CIX: 155-157ff.
- Ioffe, Abram Fedorovich. "Physics and War." *Science and Society*, VII: 193-204.
- Ipatieff, Vladimir Nikolaevich. "Modern Science in Russia." *Russian Review*, III: 1: 68-80.
- Iswolsky, Helen. "The Twilight Years of Russian Culture." *Review of Politics*, V: 356-376.
- Jakobson, Roman. "Polish-Russian Collaboration in the Science of Language." *Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences*, I: 970-974.
- Joesten, Joachim. "German Rule in Ostland." *Foreign Affairs*, XXII: 143-147.
- Karpovich, Michael. "The Nationalism of the Russian Slavophiles." Summary. *Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences*, I: 554-556.
- "Klyuchevski and Recent Trends in Russian Historiography." *Slavonic and East European Review* (Am. series 2), XXI: 31-39.
- Kayden, E. M. "Star of the Soviet Union." *Virginia Quarterly Review*, XIX: 292-300.
- Keeton, George Williams. "The Soviet and Eastern Europe." *Fortnightly Review*, CLIII: 297-302.
- Kolarz, Walter J. "Soviet Patriotism and the War." *Fortnightly Review*, CLIV: 376-384.
- Korostovetz, Vladimir de. "A Voice from the Ukraine." *Contemporary Review*, CLXIV: 239-243.
- Koten, Bernard. "Soviet Medicine in Wartime." *Hygiene*, XXI: 268-270ff.

- Lancaster, William W. "Our Relations with Russia." *Foreign Policy Reports*, XIV: 196-198.
- Lange, Oscar. "The Working Principles of the Soviet Economy." The Russian Economic Institute (*Pamphlet Series No. 1*).
- Laserson, Max M. "On the Sociology of Ethics." (The Marxist theory of the state.) *Journal of Philosophy*, XL: 6: 148-156.
- (ed.) "The Development of Soviet Foreign Policy in Europe, 1917-1942." A selection of documents. *International Conciliation* CLXXXVI: 5-95.
- Lazarev, Nikolai. "A Soviet Criticism of Air Power—and a Reply." *Free World*, VI: 2: 154-157.
- Lednicki, Wacław. "Russian Literature." *Bulletin of the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences*, I: 904-910.
- Leyda, Jay. "Soviet Literature and the Soviet Cinema." *The Harvard Advocate*, CXXIX: 4.
- Lobanov-Rostovsky, A. "Russia and Germany: an Historical Survey of Russo-German Relations." *Russian Review*, TII: L2 27-44.
- Loewenson, Leo. "Some Recent Books on Russian History" *History*, XXVIII: 207-215.
- Lyons, Eugene. "Cooperating with Russia." *American Mercury*, LVI: 536-545.
- "Soviet Foreign Policies." *American Mercury*, LVI: 367-373.
- "U. S. A., Britain, U. S. S. R." *American Mercury*, LVII: 599-601.
- "The Progress of Stalin Worship." *American Mercury*, LVI: 693-697.
- Mallory, J. I. "Religion in Russia." *Catholic World*, CLVII: 319.
- Mandel, William. "The Victors of Stalingrad." *Soviet Russia Today*, March, pp. 14-17.
- Manning, Clarence A. "Count Alexis K. Tolstoy." *Russian Orthodox Journal*, XVII: 6-7.
- "The Humorous Poems of Count A. K. Tolstoy." *Russian Review*, II: 2: 88-96.
- "Thoreau and Tolstoy." *New England Quarterly*, XVI: 234-243.
- Maurer, Rose. "The Buriat Mongols and the War." *Asia*, XLIII: 290-294.
- Marlowe, Dave. "Murmansk, 1943: How It Looked to a Merchant Seaman." *Harper*, CLXXXVII: 267-274.
- Maynard, John. "Collectivization of Agriculture: Russia and India; with Discussion." *Asiatic Review*, XXXIX: 113-127.
- Miller, Hunter. "Russian Opinion on the Cession of Alaska." *American Historical Review*, XLVIII: 3: 521-531.
- Mohrenschildt, Dimitri von. "The Early American Observers of the Russian Revolution, 1917-1921." *Russian Review*, III: 1: 64-74.
- "Russian Literature in English Translation." *Comparative Literature News Letter*, I: 5.
- Moldenke, H. N. "New Sources of Rubber." (The Russian Koksagyz.) *Natural History*, LII: 226-229.
- Monahan, James. "The End of the Russian Ballet." *Nineteenth Century and After*, CXXXIII: 226-229.
- Morkovin, B. V. "The Old and New Russia." *World Affairs Interpreter*, XIV: 301-306.
- Mortimer, Raymond. "Turgenev, Expatriate." *New Statesman and Nation*, XXV: 95, 111; 26-27; 107.
- "Names of Peoples in the U.S.S.R." *Geographical Journal*, CI: 140.

- Nathan, George Jean. "Russian Drama without Tears" *American Mercury*, LVI: 747-750.
- "Oirotia: Border Region of the U.S.S.R." *Asia*, XLIII: 160-161.
- Orbeli, L. A. "Development of Biology in the Soviet Union." *Science and Society*, VII: 3: 205-216.
- Pares, Bernard. "Religion in Russia." *Foreign Affairs*, XXI: 635-644.
- Parks, George Bruner. "Occasion of Milton's Moscovia" *Studies in Philology*, XL: 399-404.
- Parry, Albert. "Cassius Clay's Glimpse into the Future: Lincoln's Envoy to St. Petersburg Bade the Two Nations Meet in East Asia." *Russian Review*, II: 2: 52-67.
- "Peregrinus." "The Baltic-Black Sea Zone and Britain." *Contemporary Review*, CLXIV: 156-160.
- Polyani, Karl. "Why Make Russia Run Amok?" *Harper*, CLXX-XVI: 404-410.
- Potemkin, Vladimir. "The Soviet Union's Struggle for Peace in the Period before World War II." *Communist*, XXII: 917-921.
- Price, M. Philips. "Moscow and After." *Contemporary Review*, CLXIV: 321-326.
- Pritchett, V. S. "Chekhov and the Soviet Writers." *New Statesman and Nation*, XXV: 209.
- "The Great Works of Dostoevsky." *New Statesman and Nation*, XXV: 175.
- Pritt, D. N. "Twenty-five Years of Soviet Achievement." *Anglo-Soviet Journal*, IV: 8-17.
- Queen, George Sherman. "An American Employer and Russian Labor in 1905." *Journal of Modern History*, XV: 120-126.
- Rabinavicius, Henricas. "The Fate of the Baltic Nations." *Russian Review*, III: I: 34-44.
- "The Red Army Today." *U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, LXIX: 1263-1265.
- Ropes, E. C. "American-Soviet Trade Relations." *Russian Review*, III: 1: 89-94.
- Ross, Earl Clarendon. "Sevastopol and Russia." *Virginia Quarterly Review*, XIX: 599-602.
- Russell, Bertrand. "The Russian Realities: Only if We Can Face Them Can We Keep the Peace." *Common Sense*, XII: 351-354.
- "Russia and the Future." *Canadian Forum*, XXIII: 29.
- "Russia in the Future." *Round Table*, September, No. 132, 327-332.
- "Russian Armored Trains." *Infantry Journal*, LII: 2: 77-78.
- "Russian Expedition to Japan in 1852: Report of Captain Hindenberg of the Russian-American Company's Ship *Prince Menchikoff* to the Commander of the Colony of Sitka." *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, XXXIV: 159-167.
- Schakowskoy, Zinaida. "Tchehov." *Contemporary Review*, CLXIV: 296-300.
- Schlesinger, Rudolf. "Coordination of War Aims." *Political Quarterly*, XIV: 101-106.
- Scott, John. "Magnetic City, Core of Valiant Russia's Industrial Might." *National Geographic Magazine*, LXXXIII: 525-556.
- Shub, David. "The Russian Press in the United States." *Russian Review*, III: I: 120-128.
- Simmons, Ernest J. "The Place of Russia in Comparative Literature." *Comparative Literature News Letter*, I: 1-2.
- "The Study of Contemporary Russian Civilization." *Journal of Higher Education*, November, 439-440.

- "Soviet Workers in Germany; Methods of Recruitment and Conditions of Employment." *International Labour Review*, XLVII: 576-590.
- Sternberg, Fritz. "Russia, Major Power in Asia." *Asia*, XLIII: 534-538.
- Stowe, Leland. "Evolution of the Red Army." *Foreign Affairs*, XXII: 94-105.
- "Living with the Russians." *Rotarian*, LXII: 11-13.
- Strelsky, K. and N. "Books and Articles on Russia Published in 1942." *Russian Review*, II: 2: 113-121.
- Talmadge, I. D. W. "The Enjoyment of Laughter in Russia." *Russian Review* II: 2: 45-51.
- Tate, Allan. "Dostoevsky's Hovering Fly: a Causerie on the Imagination and the Actual World." *Sewanee Review*, LI: 353-369.
- Thompson, Carol. "Open Rift with Russia." *Current History*, IV: 193-194.
- Thompson, Paul Williams. "Bridgehead of the Irsha." *Infantry Journal*, LII: 5: 28-32.
- "The Nazi's Own Appraisal of the Russian Soldier." *Reader's Digest*, XLII: 15-18.
- "Sevastopol and Verdun." *Infantry Journal*, LII: 1: 9-17; II: 14-24.
- Timasheff, N. S. "The Russian Revolution Twenty-Five Years After." *Review of Politics*, V: 415-440.
- Tolstoi, Alexei. "Trends in Soviet Literature." *Science and Society*, VII: 233-250.
- Treviranus, G. R. "Towards the Next Russian Revolution." *Dalhousie Review*, XXIII: 339-344.
- Utkin, Joseph. "Russian Guerilla Warfare." *Free World*, VI: 2: 117-119.
- Vagts, Alfred. "A Memoir of Military Occupation." *Military Affairs*, VII: 16-24.
- "Stalingrad: City into Fortress." *Infantry Journal*, LII: 1: 44-45.
- Vakar, Nikolai P. "Russia and the Baltic States." *Russian Review*, III: 1: 45-54.
- Varneck, Elena. "Siberian Native Peoples after the February Revolution." *Slavonic and East European Review* (Am. series 2), XXI: 70-88.
- Vernadsky, Nina. "Lermontov in Russian Music." *Slavonic and East European Review* (Am. series 2), XXI: 6-30.
- Vinokur, Grigori. "Soviet Linguistics in 1942." *Modern Language Review*, XXXVIII: 242-243.
- "Vocational Training and Labour Reserves in the U.S.S.R." *International Labour Review*, XLVII: 499-501.
- Voigt, Fritz August. "Constants in Russian Foreign Policy." *Nineteenth Century and After*, CXXIV: 193-200; 241-247.
- "Poland, Russia, and Great Britain." *Nineteenth Century and After*, CXXXIII: 241-259.
- Volin, Lazar. "The Russian Food Situation." *Annals of the American Academy*, CCXXV: 89-91.
- "The New Agrarian Order in Nazi-Invaded Russia." *Foreign Agriculture*, VII: 75-84.
- "German Invasion and Russian Agriculture." *Russian Review*, III: 1: 75-88.
- Wasserman, Louis. "The Russian Heartland: Pivot of World Politics." *World Affairs Interpreter*, XII: 407-416.
- Whitworth, Charles E. "Russian Railways." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, CCXXX: 150-158.

- Wildes, Harry Emerson. "Russia Meets the Japanese." *Russian Review*, III: 1: 55-63.
- Williams, Albert Rhys. "The Soviet People's Army." *Asia*, XLIII: 10-14.
- "The Soviets and America." *Free World*. V: 70-74.
- Willkie, Wendell. "Life on the Russian Frontier." *Reader's Digest*, XLII: 1-7.
- Wilson, Edmund. "Notes on Russian Literature." *Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXII: 5: 78-81.
- "Notes on Russian Literature. Pushkin." *Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXII: 6: 79-83.
- Winter, Ella. "Our Allies the Russians." *Ladies' Home Journal*, LX: 37ff.
- Wolfe, B. D. "Stalin at the Peace Table: How Will He Play His Hand?" *Common Sense*, XII: 160-162.
- Yakhontoff, Victor A. "The U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R." *Asia*, XLIII: 512-516.
- Yarham, E. R. "A Seaway Across the Top of the World." (Great feats of Russia's captains of the ice). *Canadian Geographical Journal*, XXVI: 178-184.
- Young, George. "The Anglo-Russian Relationship." *Contemporary Review*, CLXIV: 258-262.
- Znakomy, Leonid, and Levin, Dan. "Total War and Literature." (Notes on contemporary Soviet writers). *Books Abroad*, XVII: 106-108.
- Zoff, Otto. "The Timurites." *Asia*, XLIII: 520-522.

PITMAN Texts TEACH!

Bondar's SIMPLIFIED RUSSIAN METHOD (Conversational and Commercial) Sixth Edition, Revised by Louis Segal.
325 pages \$2.50

ROOTS OF THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE by G. Z. Patrick (Elementary Guide to Russian Word-Building)
240 pages \$1.50

ELEMENTARY RUSSIAN READER by G. Z. Patrick
167 pages \$1.20

ADVANCED RUSSIAN READER by G. Z. Patrick
262 pages \$1.50

BORIS GODUNOV (Pushkin)
A Segal Reader, Second Edition
\$1.00

RUSSIAN IDIOMS AND PHRASES by Louis Segal \$.75

ELEMENTARY GUIDE TO RUSSIAN PRONUNCIATION
by G. Z. Patrick
58 pages \$.85

RUSSIAN TRADE AND INDUSTRY (Reader) by V. G. Olkhovsky
In Preparation About \$1.25

RUSSIAN SCIENTIFIC READER by G. A. Znamensky
In Preparation About \$1.75

FIRST RUSSIAN READER AND SECOND RUSSIAN READER
by Segal Each \$.60

Bondar's RUSSIAN READERS
No. 1. Queen of Spades \$.85
2. Humorous Stories \$.85

Pitman Publishing Corporation

2 West 45 St., New York City 19

205 West Monroe St., Chicago

I:

A.

I:

oss

eat

the

ral

is-

or-

an.

e."

riet

II:

sia,